

SCS #1399

Thomas F. Torrance

SCJ # 1399

THE
Ancient Bishops

CONSIDER'D;

Both with respect to the Extent of Their

JURISDICTION,

AND

Nature of Their POWER.

IN ANSWER to

Mr. *Chillingworth* and Others.

WHEREIN

The Conformity of the Government and Discipline of the Church of *Scotland*, with that of the Ancient Church, is fully manifested: And it is made evident, that the Ministers of the Gospel, or *Pastors of the Parishes*, are not *Presbyters* but *Bishops*; and that the Government of the Church by *Presbyteries, Synods, General Assemblies*, and *Commissions of General Assemblies*, is not *Presbyterian* but *Episcopal* Government.

By *Alexander Lauder*, Minister of the Gospel at *Mordentoun*.

Episcopi Sacerdotes se esse noverint, non Dominos. Hieron. Ep. ad Nepotia.

Quid est enim Paulus, vel quid Apollo? Utrique Ministri ejus in quem credidistis. Est ergo in universis Servientibus, non Dominium, sed Ministerium. Optat. Lib. 5.

Quantus arrogantiae tumor est, quanta humilitatis & lenitatis oblivio, arrogantiae suae quanta jactatio, ut quis aut audeat, aut facere se posse credat, quod nec Apostolis concessit Dominus! Cypr. Ep. 55.

EDINBURGH:

Printed by *James Watson* in *Craig's Close*. 1707.



THE PREFACE

TO offer at this time a Day, to answer Mr. Chillingworth's Demonstration of Episcopacy, or, Archbishop Usher's Original of Bishops and Metropolitans, old Writings, and which may be suppos'd to be long ago buried in oblivion; may perhaps be thought an odd and improper Undertaking, and be imputed to a contentious Humour, or an unreasonable Desire to revive ancient Debates, and perpetuate Heats and Animosities in the Church.

But considering these Writings were not long since reprinted at Edinburgh, with a Design, no doubt, to make us believe, That the Government which is now call'd Episcopal, is the same with that which was instituted by the Apostles, and was the Government of the Ancient Church in the purest Ages; and seeing the Party, as may be easily judged, will readily cry them up as Unanswerable, and pretend they prove to a Demonstration, That our present Happy Establishment is not capable of a rational Defence; I thought I would not be condemn'd by equitable Persons, if I should undertake to discover the Vanity of such a Pretence, or make it appear, That that Episcopacy which was of late so justly thrown out of this Church, (and which, as we have good Ground to hope, shall never infest

it again any more, the Government thereof as it is now Established, being made a Fundamental Article of the Union betwixt the two Kingdoms, and declared Unalterable by the Parliament of Great-Britain in all time coming) is not at all proven by these or the like Writings, to be either Apostolical or Ancient : And consequently, that they who build their Practice on such weak and unsound Foundations, have need to consider, how they will be able to answer before God, for their rending his Church, by making a Schism therein, and keeping up a scandalous and unaccountable Division amongst us.

I have not insisted so much as I might on proving, The ancient Bishops were only Pastors of one Congregation, this being done already to excellent purpose by several Eminent Persons, such as Dr. Owen, Mr. Baxter, Mr. Clarkson, and others, so whose Learn'd and elaborate Writings I must refer the Reader for more full satisfaction as to this Particular : Only I have selected a few of their Arguments, which I judged to be Decisive of the Controversy, and vindicated them, manifesting the Weakness and frivolousness of Dr. Maurice's Exceptions against them. Nevertheless I have insisted more largely on the Cyprianick Times, supposing I have gain'd my Point, if I make it appear, That all the Bishops then, were what we now call Pastors of Parishes.

I look'd on't as more peculiarly my Business, to answer the Arguments of our Prelatists for the Episcopal Sovereignty, or by which they undertake to prove, the ancient Bishops had Absolute Power, or at least a Negative Voice in their Churches, patched up from Sentences, Phrases, and Modes
of

of Expression in the Works of Cyprian, and other Authors in and before his time ; or the way and manner of wording things in Canons of ancient Councils : And if I have follow'd an unusual Method here, and that be reckon'd something bold, I shall think it nowise below me to retract, as soon as any Person makes it evident by solid Arguments, the way I have taken is not rational. However, it must be remember'd, that a Scoff and Jeer, or saucy Reflections, which some use to have recourse to, when they find they can make no other Answer, will not be taken for Probation.

*I desire it may be observed here, that this whole Controversy turns principally on these two Points. Wherefore they who undertake to prove, That that which is now call'd Episcopal Government, was the Government of the Ancient Church, must prove by convincing Arguments, 1st. That they who were call'd Bishops in the three first Centuries, had Diocesses consisting of many distinct Congregations, and Presbyters under them acting as constant Pastors of these Congregations, by daily Preaching the Word, and Administration of Sacraments. And 2dly. That these Bishops had Absolute Power over these Churches and Pastors, or at least a Negative Voice. And if these be not proved clearly and distinctly, nothing is done to purpose: For, if the Episcopal Diocesses during these Centuries, were only Congregational Churches, in which the Bishops themselves officiated as daily and constant Pastors; and if they had neither Absolute Power nor a Negative Voice, the Pastors of our Parishes, or they who are reckon'd Presbyters in this Age, are Bishops of the same kind; and any little disparity that may
be*

be instanced, will never amount to the constituting a Specific Difference betwixt 'em.

If this be carefully minded by these who peruse the Writings of the Prelatists on this Controversy, they will quickly perceive, that few or none of 'em touch the Point, and that the Arguments these Writers generally insist on are defective and Sophistical.

Some of them will tell you, That the Priests were superiour to the Levites, and that it is not reasonable to suppose, That what was instituted by Divine Appointment under the old Testament in matter of meer Government, and for preservation of good Order, should be abrogated under the New; That the Apostles were superior to the Seventy Disciples; That the Angels of the Seven Churches in the Book of the Revelation were Diocesan Bishops; as also, Timothy and Titus: And that Bishops are mention'd as distinct from Presbyters, or superior to them, in the Writings of Ignatius, Tertullian, Origen, Cyprian, &c. Others of them say, That James was Diocesan Prelate of Jerusalem, because Peter said, Acts 12. 17. Go shew these things unto James, and to the Brethren, Why to James? but because he was Diocesan Prelate. And Gal. 2. 12. For before that certain came from James, &c. And Acts 21. 18. The day following, Paul went in with us unto James and all the Elders, or Presbyters, were present: Were they equal with James? No, for he was Chief; he was Prelate over them, their Assembly is call'd by his Name, &c. In like manner, That Ananias was Diocesan Prelate of Damascus, because he baptiz'd Paul who was a grievous Persecutor, Baptism being
reck-

reckon'd the Prerogative of the Bishop in the Ancient Church, &c. That *Paul's* saying to *Timothy*, *If a Man desire the Office of a Bishop, he desireth a good Work, a Bishop then must be blameless, &c.* is a Commission (upon Record) issued out for the setting up of Diocesan Episcopacy; That his saying to *Titus*, *For this cause left I thee in Crete, &c.* was a direct Command to *Titus* to set up Diocesan Episcopacy forthwith in that Isle, &c. †.

But what can be made of all this? Nothing at all against Scottish Presbytery, and as little for English Episcopacy. Do such Arguments prove, That by Divine or Apostolical appointment, every Christian Bishop should have a Multitude of Congregations, or particular Churches in his Diocese, or under his Episcopal Jurisdiction, and should be vested with an Absolute Authority, or a Negative Voice at the least; Or, that this was the Practice of the Churches in the three first Centuries? These Arguments prove that even as evidently, as our Saviour's Words, Tu es Petrus, prove the universal Supremacy of the Bishop of Rome.

And it is not enough to these who stand up in defence of English Episcopacy, or are for obtruding it on the Churches, to prove that every Bishop in the said Centuries, and by Divine Warrant, had such a Number of Congregations under his Charge, and was vested with such Power as we have been speaking of; it is farther incumbent on them to make it appear by undeniable Proofs, that each Bishop during these Centuries, and that by Apostolical Appointment, rul'd the Congregations belong-

† *Thomas Edwards* in his *Diocesan Episcopacy* proved from Scripture, page 133, 138, 179, 184, &c.

longing to his Diocess, not in conjunction with the Presbytery, (that is, all the Presbyters of his Diocess) but by A Court of Secular Officers, a Chancellor, Sub-Chancellor, &c. to the total Exclusion of the Presbyters from meddling in Affairs of Discipline, or the infliction of Ecclesiastical Censures on the Scandalous.

In like manner, they who set up in defence of such Prelacy as was in Scotland, must make it evident, That in ancient Times, and by vertue of Divine Institution, there were in each Episcopal Diocess or Church, many distinct Presbyteries, constituted, or made up of the Pastors of the several Parishes in the Diocess ; That every one of these Presbyteries comprehended and had Jurisdiction over many distinct Sub-Presbyteries call'd Sessions ; That these Presbyteries and Sub-Presbyteries had their Presidents or Moderators, who were not Bishops, but only Presbyters ; and that these Sub-Presbyteries, and Presbyteries (together with their President-Presbyters or Moderators) managed the Discipline of the several Parishes, being accountable to the Bishop, and Synodical Meeting of all the Presbyteries in the Diocess, and their Moderators.

No Episcopal Writers ever did, or can take upon them to affirm such things, nevertheless they say, That their Episcopal Government is Apostolical, and their Bishops the same with those of the Ancient Church : But that is what cannot be helped, they take a Liberty to say what they please, for Reasons known to GOD and their own Consciences. What malignant Influence such confident Assertions, contrary to most evident and notorious matter of Fact, may have, and tendency to the
pre-

prejudice of Religion, by encouraging Incredulity, or a profane Misbelief of reveal'd Truths, I take not upon me to determine, but shall leave it to themselves to consider. Thinking and intelligent Men will not be convinced easily, that their Conscience goeth along with their Tongue, or that they believe what they say, when they affirm such things; and their affirming with so much Assurance, what can hardly in reason be suppos'd they believe themselves, is to lay no small Temptation before these who are inclin'd to Pyrrhonism in Matters of Religion, to think that they believe as little what they say with respect to the more important Articles of the Christian Faith, and that if their secular Interest should lead them to affirm, That Jesus Christ is only a made God, and the Holy Spirit is not a Person, or the like; in all probability they could do it as easily, and with as little hesitation and scruple of Conscience, as they affirm now, That their Bishops are the same with those of the Ancient Church †.

Tho I shall willingly acknowledge, that these may be justly reckon'd uncharitable and injurious Persons, who love to make such Inferences, I cannot but say, there is but too much reason to suspect the Honesty of these Prelatical Authors, who condemn the Ordinations which are perform'd by those they reckon meer Presbyters, and affirm them to be null and void, to the great scandal of all the Protestant Churches, seeing the Apostle telleth us most expressly, of the laying on of the Hands of the Presbytery, and that on Timothy,
b
who

† Bishops in the primitive Church (to wit, in the days of Ignatius) the same as now with us, (with D. Wake, in the Index to his Translation of the Epistles of Ignatius, &c.)

who in their own Opinion was a Bishop. What can they pretend against plain matter of Fact so evidently asserted in Scripture? Will they say, That these Persons who laid hands on Timothy were not meer Presbyters, but some of the Neighbouring Bishops assembl'd together and acting as a Presbytery in a joint-way; Or, That it was a Presbytery of Diocesans? But,

This Notion has no imaginable Foundation, there is no possibility of justifying such a senseless Gloss. It was never heard, that Presbytery did signify such a Meeting, or an Assembly of the Bishops of the Province; wherever this word occurs in any Ecclesiastical Author, or Writing of any Father, it must be understood as signifying the Presbytery of a particular Church or Diocess, this is the current and proper Signification thereof. Thus Ignatius, Subject to his Bishop as the Grace of GOD, and to the Presbytery, as to the Law of JESUS CHRIST: And again, Together with your most worthy Bishop, and the well wrought Spiritual Crown of your Presbytery. Neither does he take this word in any other sense in any of his Epistles. Thus Cyprian, Desolatam per lapsum quorundam Presbyterii nostri copiam. And Cornelius, Placuit contrahi Presbyterium. And in a word, they cannot produce one Instance to the contrary, they cannot give us so much as one Example in the Writings of any ancient Father, where the Word Presbytery signifieth the Neighbouring Bishops, or, A Meeting of the Bishops of the Province. And seeing they affirm, that the Writings of the Fathers are the surest Commentary on the Scriptures, Timothy who was a Bishop, or rather more than a Bishop, was ordain'd
by

by meer Presbyters, the Prelatists themselves being Judges.

But if they affirm, that Paul join'd with the Presbytery in the Ordination of Timothy, (tho that is, as some think, what cannot be proved from his saying in another place, Stir up the Gift of God which is in thee, by the putting on of my Hands, because it may be suppos'd, say they, and not without reason, that the Apostle laid hands on him at another time, and for another end, in order to the collation of the extraordinary Gifts of the Spirit, as Acts 8. 17, 18.) and if they conclude hence, that these Ordinations are null and void, which are perform'd by a Presbytery without the concurrence of a Bishop; why may not others conclude, that the Ordinations of the English Bishops are null and void, because perform'd by Bishops, without the laying on of the hands of a Presbytery? it being much more certain, that a Presbytery laid hands on Timothy, than it is, that it is necessary that what we now call a Bishop should join with the Presbytery in laying on hands. And if it be pretended, that the whole Efficacy of the Ordination was from the laying on of the hands of Paul as a Bishop; that is a Notion which cannot be proved, and is silly to say no more, contrary to the nature of the thing, and may be denied as easily as affirmed. The two Houses of Lords and Commons concur in making a Law, as the Bishop or Bishops concur with the Presbytery in the Act of Ordination; but if one should say, that the whole Efficacy of the Law or Act, and binding Force of it on the Nation, is only from the House of Lords, he would neither speak good Sense, nor agreeably to the Truth.

If it be said here, That the Ordinations of the English Bishops, or these Ordinations which are perform'd by Bishops without the concurrence of the Presbytery, are not null and void, tho the Presbytery join'd with Paul in laying hands on Timothy; because it is no where asserted or enacted as a Law in Scripture, that these Ordinations are null and void, which are perform'd by Bishops without the concurrence of the Presbytery: For the same reason we conclude, That the Ordinations which are perform'd by Presbyteries without the concurrence of Bishops are not null and void, tho Paul laid hands on Timothy together with the Presbytery, it being no where declar'd in the Word of God, that these Ordinations are ineffectual which are perform'd by Presbyteries without the assistance of Bishops. Wherefore I'm of Opinion, that our Brethren in England, the Bishops and dissenting Ministers, may compone with respect to this Affair, that is, if the dissenting Ministers will reckon the Ordinations of the Bishops to be valid, tho they are perform'd without the concurrence of the Presbyteries, the Bishops may hold the Ordinations of the dissenting Ministers to be valid, tho perform'd without the concurrence of Bishops.

If they affirm, that Bishops alone should lay on hands, because Paul wrote to Timothy, Lay hands suddenly on no Man, it has been answer'd to them before now, that will no more follow, than it will that it belong'd to Timothy alone to Preach, Exhort or Rebuke, because the Apostle saith to him elsewhere, Preach the Word, be instant in Season and out of season, reprove, rebuke, exhort with all Long-suffering and Doctrine.

But if they build on the Practice of the Universal Church, or the Authority of the Canons in after-times, it will be easy to answer, That these can be of no force against Scripture Precedents, the Presbyters were deprived of their Right to Ordain, and this was reserved as a Privilege to the Bishops, Novellis & Ecclesiasticis regulis, to use the words of the Council of Sevil, that is, by new Ecclesiastical Laws, and that as says Isodore, To maintain the Authority and Splendour of the Priesthood; but Humane Regulations cannot invalidate Divine Institutions. Not to say any thing in this place, concerning Ordinations being but a Ceremony on which the validity of the Ministerial Call doth not in the least depend, tho the want of it might justly be reckon'd a piece of Informality, in regard it was a Rite practised by the Apostles, (tho without so much as the smallest Insinuation of the absolute Necessity of it) and observed by the Church Universal in all succeeding Generations.

Certainly we have reason to wonder here, how these Men we are speaking of, dare take upon them to advance a Principle so dangerous, and of such pernicious consequence, on such weak and slender Grounds ; it might be expected, if they have not thrown off not only Religion, but Humanity, that they should not so much as think on such a cursed Notion without fear and trembling, tho they had a hundred times more to say, and could propose Difficulties on the head we are not able to dissolve ; But seeing, the Arguments they found upon have nothing in them of Solidity, and are so very contemptible and superficial, that they appear to be more proper to persuade rational Men, that they know not what they are saying as to this Point, than to convince them of the truth of what they are affirming, and would have them to believe : It is too evident, they were set on VVork to invent this bloody and detestable Principle, and are influenced to propagate it among the People, not by love to the Truth, or any regard to the good of the Churches, but by a love to self-interest, or a naughty, perverse
and

*and Antichristian Disposition of Spirit; wherefore we cannot but approve the Opinion which the famous and much admir'd Monsieur Claude had of that sort of Men, when he said, * To speak my Thoughts freely, it seems to me, that this fierce Opinion of the absolute Necessity of Episcopacy, that goes so high as to own no Church, or Call, or Ministry, or Sacraments, or Salvation in the World, where there are no Episcopal Ordinations, altho the true Doctrine, the true Faith, and Piety should be there, and which would make all Religion depend upon a FORMALITY, and on such a Formality as we have shown to be of no other than Humane Institution; that Opinion I say, cannot be look'd on otherwise than as the very worst Character, and Mark of the grossest Hypocrisie, a Piece of Pharisaism all over, that strains at a Gnat when it swallows a Camel, and I cannot avoid having at least a Contempt of these kind of Thoughts, and a Compassion for those who fill their heads with them.*

These Persons think they do mighty Feats, if they can busk up little Sophisms, and by this means make their Opinions appear something plausible among the Vulgar, but Contempt is the unavoidable Consequence of these Methods; such Men as the Author of The Rights of the Christian Church asserted, can tell them roundly, That Men dare not vent such Absurdities when they talk of Civil Government, but Nonsense seems sacred when applied to the Ecclesiastical; their following these and the like Methods, gives Occasion to such VVriters to reflect on the Clergy, and to pretend, That if the State tack the Priest's Preferments to certain Opinions, they will espouse them right or wrong, and invent a thousand sophistical and knavish Methods of defending them, to the infinite prejudice of the Truth: This is a heavy Accusation, and I'm sorry that some Ground is given to the Enemies of the Church, and Haters of the Pastoral Office, to vent such Reproaches,

Pudet

..... Pudet hæc opprobria nobis

Et dici potuisse, & non potuisse refelli.

Yet care should have been taken to lay the Saddle on the right Horse, and not to accuse all for the Faults of some; but this is a piece of Justice not to be expected from every one.

Now after all, the Validity or Invalidity of Presbyterian Ordinations is what we are not in the least concerned with, for, seeing the Bishops during the three first Centuries had only Congregational Diocesses, and no Bishops are of Divine Appointment excepting such as are Pastors of one single Congregation, the Pastors of the Parishes now (or they who are reckoned Presbyters in this Generation) are Bishops every way as much; and consequently the Scottish Ordinations, or these that are performed by the Ministers of the dissenting Congregations in England, are no less Episcopal Ordinations than these which were performed by the Bishops in the third Century and upward.

D. Maurice † confesseth, that a Pastor may very well be a Bishop tho he never have more Congregations than one under his Episcopal Jurisdiction; and I believe the greater part of the Prelatists, if not all of them, are of the same Opinion. I never yet heard of any man, says the Doctor, who made it essential to a Bishop to have many Congregations under him; but it is the Order that makes a Bishop, and not the being Pastor of one or many Congregations.

If this be, the Pastors of our Parishes have no more to do but send two or three of their Number to France or Germany for Ordination (if Protestant Bishops be so selfish and ill-natured, or have so little regard to the Good of the Church and Interest of Christ, as to refuse such a thing which will cost them so little) and when they come home, and say to their Brethren, Be you Bishops, they will get the Order and consequently be as good Bishops, in the Opinion of the Prelatists themselves, as any that ever were

† Def. of Dioc. Episcop. p. 448, 450, 451.

were in England. One would think, the Case is no very dangerous, which is so easily helped. But in the mean time, is not this to consecrate nonsense, as say the Author of the Rights of the Christian Church? a man would be thought to be out of his Wits if he should say that the Queen is no Queen, and that all the Regal Acts performed by Her are null and void, because She went not Abroad at Her Accession to the Crown, and a Consistory of neighbouring Kings did not say to Her, Be you Queen of Britain. If two or three French Bishops had laid hands on some of our Presbyterian Ministers at the Revolution, and had said to them, Be you Bishops and if these Ministers had done so to all the rest, the Pastors of our Parishes had been unquestionably Bishops according to the Principles of our Adversaries: but now tho it is acknowledged they have Episcopal Diocesses, exercise the Episcopal Office, and do all things in these Diocesses that Bishops can do, yet they are no Bishops at all, nay no so much as Presbyters; the Sacraments administred by them are no Sacraments, their Churches are no Churches and in a word all is gone to Wrack and Ruine throw the Want of this Ceremony. O ye sons of men how long will ye turn my glory into shame? how long will ye love vanity, and seek after leasing? Selah.

Then, seeing our Prelatists acknowledge, that the being a Pastor of many Congregations makes not one a Bishop more than being a Pastor of one Congregation, and consequently that every single Congregation is an Episcopal Diocess, the High Church-men in England who are so zealous for the Restauration of the Apostolical Government of Episcopacy in Scotland, need not desire it to be restor'd here any other way, but by giving the Order to all the Pastors of our Parishes and making them Bishops: and if they be for other Methods, they must confess it is not the Episcopacy, or Divine Institutions they are zealous for, but some other thing which I desire not to mention. And pray, why should there be such uncharitable Division and Contentions among us, to the great prejudice of the
Stat

State, and weakening of the Nation, seeing all these may be done away, and all Parties be fully satisfied with the greatest facility imaginable? Do but give the Order to the Pastors of the dissenting Congregations in England, and let Cyprian's Rule be observed, to wit, Neque enim quisquam nostrum Episcopum se Episcoporum constituit, aut tyrannico terrore ad obsequendi necessitatem Collegas suos adigit; quando habeat omnis Episcopus pro licentia libertatis & potestatis suæ arbitrium proprium; tamque judicari ab alio non possit, quam nec ipse potest judicare. Sed expectemus universi Judicium Domini nostri Jesu Christi, qui unus & solus habet potestatem & præponendi nos in Ecclesiæ suæ gubernatione, & de actu nostro judicandi. And then an end will be put to all Persecution on this Score of whatever kind, and to all our troublesome and bloody Holy Wars.

But I'm afraid, whatever our Prelatists may pretend, that they do not believe sincerely one may be a Diocesan Bishop who is but a Pastor of one Congregation. If Dr. Maurice believed this, as he says, he need not have troubl'd himself with refuting Mr. Clarkson, he had no more to do but say, Whatever the Bishops were in and before the 4th. Century, your Pastors want the Order, and therefore cannot pretend to be Diocesan Bishops; and if he had made this evident, he had destroy'd Mr. Clarkson's Book, and render'd it quite useless. Wherefore his following Mr. Clarkson step by step, his contradicting him in every thing, and endeavouring to prove with so much earnestness, that all is false and fabulous that he advances, makes it evident, his Conscience told him, That English Episcopacy is ruin'd (notwithstanding all the fine Notions, and sublime Speculations concerning the Order) if it remain proved, That all the Bishops during the first 3 Centuries were no other but Congregational Bishops.

And certainly, such a profound Author, and a Man of such a piercing Wit as is Mr. Dodwell, would never

have thought it worth his while to write the Book he calls, *The one Altar and one Priesthood*, if he had thought, as he has affirmed, and endeavoured laboriously to prove, That Persons are made Bishops by Ordination, so that the Episcopal Power is convey'd from the Apostles by Bishops to Bishops in an uninterrupted Line of Succession; but he knew very well, that this is but an empty Notion, and however it might serve to dazzle the eyes of the more ignorant and stupid among the People, or these who have not time, and will not put themselves to the trouble of bringing things of this nature under examination, yet would be laughen at by Men of sense, wherefore he was at a great deal of pains to invent a number of cunning Sophisms, that he might induce Men to believe, That the ancient Bishops might have I know not how many subordinate Altars, or distinct Congregations in their Diocesses, notwithstanding of their talking of *The one Altar and one Bishop to every Church*.

However, if our Prelatists will adhere to this Article, and say, they are very sincere when they affirm, That one who is a Bishop but of one Congregation, is as really a Diocesan Bishop, as one who is a Bishop of 500 Congregations: Things are come to this issue, that our modern Prelates stand as it were on this small Point, to wit, their having the Order, and the Fabrick of the Hierarchy is made to depend wholly on this poor Contrivance. And if it be some other thing than the Order that makes a Bishop, if the Call to the Episcopal Office lieth in the Church's Election, and Consent of the Person elected, then our Prelatists will be necessitated to confess, That the Pastors of our Parishes have as good, nay a much firmer Title to the Episcopal Office than any Bishop in France or England.

But how do our Prelatists know, that it is the Order that makes a Bishop? What is the Foundation of their Faith? Where do the Scriptures say, That 'tis Ordination that makes the Bishop, or that Ordination is so necessary a thing, that one cannot be a Bishop without it,

tho be have an Episcopal Diocess, and be impower'd to exert the Episcopal Office? Certainly it is very strange, that the Scriptures should be totally silent as to this Point, considering that the holy Hierarchy, the validity of the Sacraments, and the very BEEING of the Church dependeth on it, if we have Faith enough to believe these Gentlemen. And be the by, we may judge here what regard these Men have to their secular Interest by the value they put upon this Nicety, in which it is so nearly concerned, they would have the People to believe, that it is as necessary to their Salvation, as the Belief of the very BEEING of a GOD, or the Divinity of JESUS CHRIST; which I can not forbear to say, is to put an Affront upon God Almighty, and to ridicule and mock their Saviour; for things of equal Necessity, must be esteem'd as of equal Value.

If a Man's being a Pastor of many Congregations, makes him not a Bishop, more than his being a Pastor of one Congregation, then certainly one Christian Congregation is an Episcopal Diocess as well as an hundred; and how is it possible, that one can have an Episcopal Diocess, and a Right to exert the Episcopal Office in that Diocess, and yet not be a Bishop for all that? Is it possible, that the Parliament can set a Man upon the Throne, impower him to create all Officers, Civil and Military, make Peace and War, call and dissolve Parliaments, execute all the Laws, and in a word, give him a Regal Power over the whole Realm, and yet not make him a King by so doing?

When the Church of Rome, for Example, became so numerous in the 4. Century, that it was divided into several distinct Congregations, and when Presbyters were set over these Congregations as Pastors, these Presbyters by being thus set over these Congregations (seeing such Congregations are Episcopal Diocesses) got Episcopal Diocesses, and by being impower'd to act as Pastors of these Congregations, were impower'd to exercise the Episcopal Office; how is it possible then, that these Pres-

byters were not made Bishops ipso facto? To tell us, that they were not thereby made Bishops, because they got not the Order of the Episcopacy, is to tell us something that is incomprehensible. For is not the Office and the Order the same thing, so that he who is put in the Office has the Order by being put therein? he who is put in the Kingly Office, has the Order of Kingship, and he who is put in the Episcopal Office, has thereby the Order of the Episcopacy. VVhat is the Order if it be consider'd as distinct from the Office, but an unintelligible Notion? How can a Man have the Order of Kingship, if he be not put in the Regal Office; or be without the Order of Kingship if he be put in that Office? If the Duke of Hanover get the Kingdom of Britain, and be impower'd to officiate as King in that Kingdom, will he not by that very thing get the Order of Kingship? These then, who get Episcopal Diocesses, and are impower'd to officiate as Bishops in these Diocesses, do by that very thing acquire the Episcopal Order,

But what is the import of this Order which they make an essential and so necessary a Point? The truth is, there is very little in it, only they would make People wonder at nothing. The whole Mystery is this; If they who have the Power of Ordination intend, that the Person whom they Ordain be a Bishop, or say when they lay hands on him, Be thou a Bishop, or, Receive thou the Episcopacy, or words to this purpose; then that Person receives the Order of the Episcopacy, or is thereby made a Bishop; and when they say to the Person on whom they lay on hands, Be thou a Presbyter, &c. that Person receives only the Oraer of the Presbyterate, and is nothing but a simple Presbyter. Wherefore, the foresaid Roman Presbyters in the 4. Century, tho they got Episcopal Diocesses by being made Pastors of distinct Congregations, and were impower'd to Offi-

Officiate as Bishops in these Churches or Congregations, yet for all that did not become Bishops, because they who laid hands on them, said not to them when they Ordain'd them, Be ye Bishops, or did not intend to make them Bishops by giving them Congregations, that is, Episcopal Diocesses, and by impowering them to act as constant Pastors of these Congregations, that is, to officiate as Bishops in these Diocesses.

But this is to speak contrary to Reason. If the King should give the Command of the Navy to a Nobleman, and empower him to act as Admiral, but when he instals him in his Office, should, instead of saying, Be thou Admiral, say, Be thou a Justice of the Peace, would that Person be a Justice of the Peace only, and not the Admiral, tho he get the Command of the Royal Fleet? Would not the King in that case say one thing and do another, would not that be to cause Words contradict Things? If that Nobleman be put in the Admiral's Office by the King, and empowered actually to Officiate as Admiral, will he not be Admiral in despite of any thing the King may think fit to say to him when he creates him Admiral? The Case is the same here, the foresaid Presbyters when they were made the Pastors of the several Congregations in Rome, (seing these Congregations were Episcopal Diocesses) they were thereby made Bishops ; whatever was said to them when they were Ordain'd, or whatever the Intention of their Ordainers might be, and they who made them such Pastors did only contradict themselves, said one thing and did another, and actually put them in the Episcopal Office, tho they intended to put them only in the Office of Presbyters. The verity then

is this, In that moment when the Church of Rome was first divided into distinct Congregations, it was divided really into distinct Episcopal Diocesses, and when the Presbyters were made the Pastors of these Congregations, they were made Diocesan Bishops ipso facto, and from that instant, he who was Bishop of Rome before, did cease to be a Bishop, and was transformed into some other thing, and all his Successors after him were something else than Bishops, and continue so to be to this day. And the same may be said of all the other Bishops at that time who became Pastors of more Congregations or Episcopal Diocesses than one.

To apply this to the purpose in hand; the first Presbyterian Ministers in Scotland were Ordain'd by Popish Prelates, or by Persons who were Ordain'd by such Prelates, and seeing these Prelates Ordain'd them Pastors of Congregations, and seeing Congregations are Episcopal Diocesses, these Prelates Ordain'd them Diocesan Bishops, and their saying to them when they Ordain'd them only, Be you Presbyters, was nothing but a Contradiction, and I hope, their contradicting themselves could not alter Matter of Fact, or make these Persons Presbyters, whom they actually set over Episcopal Diocesses, more than the King's saying, Be you a Justice of the Peace, could hinder that Man to be Admiral, to whom he gave the Command of the Navy. Mr. Dodwell says, † That the Ordain'd receive no more Power from their Ordainers than they actually intend to give them, but when the Popish Prelates Ordain'd the Pastors, they never intended to give them the Power of Bishops, but
the

the Power of Presbyters only, wherefore they actually received no more but the Power of Presbyters when they were Ordain'd. But we must not think that Intentions can alter Things: If a Person intending to give a Half-Crown only to a Beggar, give him a whole Crown, will the Intention convert the Crown into a Half-Crown?

*From what has been said here I hope it is evident, that our Prelatical People in Scotland have need to rectify their Opinion about the Nature of Episcopacy, they think there cannot be Episcopal Government in this Church, unless the 14 Bishops be restor'd again to their Diocesses, but they are in a Mistake: Why 14 Bishops only? Can any Reason be given why we should not have a far greater Number in this Church? Why not 500 Bishops rather than 14? Nay what is there to hinder us from having 1000 Bishops? If it be their desire to be living under Episcopal Inspection, the greater Number of Bishops they have to take care of them, the greater Reason they have to be satisfied. The King and Parliament did not abolish Episcopacy at the Revolution when they abolished the late Prelacy, they only divided the Episcopal Diocesses, and made them more numerous: And what harm was there in that? What Scripture Rule, Divine Law, or Appointment of Jesus Christ did they violate by so doing? none at all I can assure them; and if they will not notice what I say to them, I hope they will have some regard to what the Great and Famous Episcopal Divines in England say, let them hear D. Barow, By the Law of God, says he, * and according to the ancient Practice, Princes may model the Bounds of Episcopal Ju-*

* Pope's Suprem. p. 256. in Quarto.

Jurisdiction, erect Bishopricks, enlarge, diminish, or transfer them as they please. *And if they may diminish Bishopricks as they please, and that by the Law of God, they may diminish them into one Congregation. And what Reason is there to complain then on this account? What Reason to separate from the Established Church? But to return,*

We have not satisfied our selves with proving in the following Treatise, That the ancient Bishops were meerly Congregational, and that they had not a Negative Voice, much less such Absolute Power as some pretend they had, and consequently were the same with these who are the Pastors of the Parishes now, or who are accounted Presbyters in this Generation; but that it might be yet more evident that the Government of this Church, or that which is commonly called Presbyterian Government, is really Episcopal Government, in the same sense the Government of the Church was Episcopal in the 3. or 4. Centuries, (and consequently, That the Government of the Church of England is not, and the late Prelatical Government in Scotland was not properly Episcopal) we have made it appear, That the ancient Church had these Ecclesiastical Courts which are call'd Presbyteries, Synods, General-Assemblies, and Commissions of General-Assemblies, in Scotland at this day: And moreover, that the Presbyterian Discipline is the same with that of the ancient Church, by comparing the Acts of our General-Assemblies with Canons of Ancient Councils.

And seing, J. S. is the last that has handled this Subject, and undertaken to prove, That the Bishops had Absolute Power in the days of Cyprian, and he being a learn'd Man, and one who has a good

Talent of writing, it may be suppos'd he has gather'd together the Flower and Strength of what has been said on the Head, whether by Mr. Dodwell, or other great Patrons of the Cause; therefore we thought it would not be amiss to consider the fore-said Arguments, as they are represented and set down by him in his Vind. Princ. Cypr. Age; and tho that Book appears to have been written in great bitterness, and with a Design to irritate, or stir up Passion and Fury, we have guarded against personal Reflections, and indecent Expressions very carefully.

But when the things our Adversaries say are notoriously senseless or impious, when they confine the Church Universal to one external Communion, and affirm all these Christians are out of the Church who have not such Bishops forsooth as they are for; by which means, the greater part of the Reformed Churches, if not all of them except that of England, are put in the Rank of Turks and Pagans: Or, when they tell us, we have the same (if not better) Evidence of their Episcopacy's having been the Government of the Church ever since the Days of the Apostles, than we have for the Canon of the Scripture, I hope, no sober Christian or reasonable Person (tho prejudic'd in favours of that Sort of Episcopacy we are writing against,) will blame us, if we happen to speak of such Extravagancies, or these who have the confidence to advance them, with that disdain and contempt they deserve.

The Learn'd Mr. Jameson has already taken this Book we are speaking of to Task, but considering this was finish'd before his Answer was printed, and that the Method he takes is very different

d

from

from that follow'd here, and that he intending a compleat Answer to J. S. insists much on many things we meddle not with, as not lying in our Road, and that we have insisted more fully on some things he thought not fit to enlarge upon, it was judged, his Book need not hinder the Publication of this Essay.

I am not ignorant, that there are some among us who look on these things we are speaking of as meer Trifles, and reckon it a Matter of very small moment whether the Government of the Church be Monarchical or Aristocratical, or whether it have any Government at all; such, may be, will not be at the pains so much as to cast their Eye on a Writing like this, thinking anything J. S. or I, or any other can say on this Head deserves not their Consideration, and that their time is much more profitably employed in reading Comedies and Plays, or at Gaming: Perhaps such Persons are not much injur'd by those who consider them as a bad Set of People; for my own part, their Opinion about things is what I have but very little regard to, and intend not to trouble my self with, it was not at all for them that I undertook this Work; but if what is done be any way serviceable, or in the least helpful to these who love the Truth, especially that which has relation to the Church or Religion, and have Inclinations to search after the knowledge of it, I have gain'd my Point, and shall think my Pains well bestow'd.

A N
A N S W E R
T O
Mr. CHILLINGWORTH's
Demonstration of *Episcopacy*.

C H A P. I.

The State of the Controversy between us and Mr. CHILLINGWORTH cleared, and the several Propositions he should have demonstrated, pointed at.

TH E Government of the Church of *England*, if some Persons among us may be believed, is Divine and Apostolical; yet you see the Acute M. *Chillingworth* (and many other Divines of that Church, as *J. S.* informs us) will not own it to be such, till some *Accidentals* be abstracted from it: But I'm afraid, if *Episcopacy* were strip'd of some of these *Accidentals*, which it has now in *England* and the *Roman Territories*, and made a Business not of advantage or

Vind. Prin.
Cyp. Age.
p. 158. in
Marg.

wordly gain, but of labour and difficulties, as it was in the second Century, it would not have so many Learn'd and Zealous Defenders; and in all appearance we should see an end put to our Controversies about it in a very short time.

However, 'tis confest, it seems that if the *English* Bishops be consider'd in their present state, they differ from those who lived in the second Centurie. But says M. C. *If you abstract from them all Accidentals, and consider only what is Essential to their Office,* 'twill be found they are such as these were. That is, abstract from the present Bishops, every thing that makes 'em to differ from those in the second Century, and then there will be no difference betwixt 'em. That is very true. Thus if you abstract from the present Bishop of *Rome*, his Supremacy, the Power he pretends to over Princes, &c. he will be such another Bishop as was Pope *Victor* in the second Centurie. But the question is not, what the *English* Bishops would be, if such or such things were abstracted from them, but what they are really, and what, for ought I see, they are resolved to be, let us say what we will.

But these things M. C. desires us to abstract from the present Bishops (such as their sitting in Parliament, acting as Secular Judges, their ruling by a Chancellour, Sub-chancellour, and Officers of that kind, to the Exclusion of the *Presbyterie* or the *Presbyters* of the Diocess, &c.) that they may be like the second Century Bishops, are but *Accidentals*.

And so is wickedness and corruption of Nature accidental to the Devil. Says M. C. If all Accidentals be abstracted from the present Bishops, they will be like those in the second Centurie. And say we, If all Accidentals were abstracted from the Devil, there would be no difference betwixt him and an Angel of Light. But these Accidentals stick close to the Devil, and therefore he is not like an Angel of Light; and the *English* Bishops adhere to these Accidentals

M. C.

M. C. would have us to abstract from Episcopacy, and therefore they are not like the Bishops of the second Centurie.

But when all these things *M. C.* reckons accidental to *Episcopacy*, are abstracted from it, and nothing left but what he counts Essential, the present *English* Bishops will so little resemble those who lived in the second Centurie, that, to give them one name, will be to confound things of very different natures. And this is evident, because it can't be made to appear, that the Bishops in the second Centurie had any of these things our Author makes essential to *Episcopacy*. According to him it is Essential,

(1st.) *That the Bishop have all the Churches or Congregations within a certain Precinct or Diocese under his Care.*

Wherefore, seeing some of the *English* Bishops have 8, some of them 900 particular Churches under their Care, it must be proven, that they in the second Centurie were Bishops of some hundreds, or at least scores of particular Churches, else there will be no proportion betwixt them and those now in *England*. If it be said, *majus and minus non variant speciem*; it must be confessed that a Bishop, who has but two or three hundred Souls in his whole Diocese, differs not specifically from one like the Bishop of *London*, who has, may be, two or three millions.

(2dly.) *That he have Authority over all these Churches, not absolute indeed, but regulated by Laws, and moderated by his having a convenient number of Assistants join'd to him.*

Our Author expresses himself here something obscurely. First he tells us not what he understands by *Assistants* join'd to his Bishop.

But we take it for granted, that he understood the *Presbyters* hereby, and do not suspect that he intended to leave some room here for the Chancellour, Sub-chancellour of the Diocese, and other Officials;

4 *An Answer to Mr. Chillingworth's*

or that he would have us to believe, that the Bishops in the second Centurie governed their Diocesses by *Assistants* of that kind.

Neither doth he tell us, what he understands by *convenient number of Assistants*, whether all the *Presbyters* of the Diocess, or a select number of 'em only. But seeing not all the *Presbyters* of an *English* Diocess, but some only, that is, a dozen, may be, or two, where perhaps there are eight or nine hundred, are the Bishop's Assistants in the Government, by *competent number of Assistants*, we must understand such a Chapter, or small number of the *Presbyters*, in the *Episcopal* Diocess: then *Convenient Number* uses not to be taken for the *whole Number*.

Either then it must be proven, that some few only of the *Presbyters* of the Diocess, were, in the second Centurie, the Bishop's *Assistants* in the Government, or made up that Court which is call'd the *Presbytery*, in *Ignatius's* or *Cyprian's* Epistles, and the like; or it must be acknowledged, that our Author's Demonstration cometh to nothing. If it be found, that all the *Presbyters* of the Diocess were Members of that which was call'd the *Presbyterie* in the second Centurie, and that they did *all* of them act in conjunction with their Bishop in Affairs of Government then; it will be evident, there is as great a difference betwixt the present Bishops, and those who lived in that Centurie, as betwixt the King of *Britain*, who is obliged to rule with Consent of the Parliaments, and a King who should abrogate and destroy Parliaments, and govern with the Advice of a few Servants or Courtiers, that is, as there is betwixt a Tyrant and a lawful Magistrate.

In the third place, it is no less difficult to know what he understands by *Moderated*: Whether these *Assistants* should *moderate* the Bishop's Authority by exerting a Negative Voice; or whether they should be Counsellors only: So that their *moderating* his

Authority will amount to no more but *advising*, which is a feeble way of Moderating.

The Chapter or *Assistants* of the *English* Bishop are Counsellors only, and have not a Negative upon his Lordship. It must be made appear then, that he who was call'd Bishop in the second Centurie, could act as he pleas'd in the Affairs of Government, with or against the Consent of these few of the *Presbyters*, who (according to M. C's way of expression) were his Assistants; or it must be confessed, that our Author should have given another Name than *Demonstration* to his Writing. In a word, nothing can be made of this Demonstration, till these three things be proven to us with great Evidence, even as great as the nature of a Demonstration requires.

First, That the Bishops in the second Centurie had every one of them many Churches under Charge,

Secondly, That they acted in Affairs of Discipline, not in conjunction with *all* their *Presbyters*, but a small number of them only, the Body or far greater part being excluded from the Government wholly, by the Bishop and his *Assistants* or Chapter.

Thirdly, That the Bishop could rule with or against the consent of these few of the *Presbyters*, who us'd to sit or act in conjunction with him.

Now if any of these three Particulars be not proven, not only the Demonstration falls, but it will be evident, there was no such thing in the second Centurie, as a Diocesan Bishop of the modern fashion. For Mr. C. reckons these three things essential; and it is clear, nothing can be without what is essential. Let us see then what kind of Arguments he proposes.

When I first read the splendid Title of this Discourse, viz. *Demonstration of Episcopacy*, I expected great things, more weighty Arguments than any hitherto produced in favours of the Cause; but the truth is, I was something surpris'd when I found, that all the Probation came to no more but the Opini-

6 *An Answer to Mr. Chillingworth's*

nion of two or three private Divines. *Molinaus* and *Beza* say such things, *Ergo*, A weak foundation to a Demonstration. *Beza* and *Molinaus* were Great Men, and *Presbyterians* too, but not infallible; 'tis possible they might mistake: I have known as Great and Learn'd Men as any of 'em mistake a thing egregiously. Mr. C. was a Learn'd Man, yet nothing weaker than his Demonstration of *Episcopacy*. What more ridiculous than to obtrude upon us the Opinion of a private Divine or two as Demonstration?

But what do *Molinaus* and *Beza* say? *They confess*, says Mr. C. *That this Government was received universally in the Church, either in the Apostles time or presently after.* What Government? to wit, the *Episcopal Government* before described. But this is a falsity: Neither *Molinaus* nor *Beza* confess any such thing.

Molinaus does indeed say, *Statim post, &c.* † *In the time of the Apostles, or soon after, as Ecclesiastical Historie testifies, it was appointed that in one City, one among the Presbyters should be call'd Bishop, and have a Prebeminence among his Colleagues, to shun that Confusion which is caus'd by equality.* But what is this to the purpose? Is this to confess, that in the time of the Apostles or soon after, every Bishop had some hundreds or scores of Churches under his Charge? Or that he, who was call'd Bishop in the second Centurie, did not act in Affairs of Government in conjunction with all the *Presbyters* of the Diocess, but a small number of them only, excluding the rest? Or is this to confess, that the Bishop then could act whether these few of his *Presbyters*, who were his *Assistants* in the Government, consented or not? Will it follow that *Molinaus* confessed, there was such an *Episcopacy* in the second Centurie, as Mr. C. describes, because

† *Statim post Apostolorum, aut etiam eorum tempore, ut testatur Historia Ecclesiastica, constitutum est ut in una Urbe, unus inter ceteros Presbyteros Episcopus vocaretur, qui inter suos Collegas haberet præminentiam, ad vitandam Confusionem quæ ex æqualitate nascitur.*

because he says, that one of the *Presbyters* was call'd Bishop then, and had a Preheminence among his Collegues? Not at all.

Perhaps we will grant, that there were Bishops in the beginning of the second Centurie, that these Bishops were above the *Presbyters*, had a Majority, Superiority of Power, and Preheminence. But be it known, that this will make nothing for that sort of *Episcopacy* which is pleaded for at this day. There were Consuls in the *Roman Senate*, who had a Preheminence, not only a Superiority of Dignity, but a Power superiour to that of any Senator; † yet had they not a Negative Voice in the Senate, much less such a Power as our modern Prelate pretends to in the Church.

'Tis to no purpose then to tell us, that this and the other *Presbyterian* Author makes such or such Concessions, unless these Authors concede, that the Bishops in the second Centurie had a Negative Voice at least; and tho they should grant this, we will have but very little regard to them. (even our great Champions *Blondel* and *Salmasius* themselves) unless they prove it very evidently.

Wherefore *J. S.* did put himself to a deal of needless trouble, by heaping together so many Citations out of *Presbyterian* Writers of all sorts, granting there were Bishops in the second Centurie, that these Bishops were Superiour to *Presbyters*, had more Power, or the like. The truth is, I understand not what advantage he can make to our modern Prelates by such Concessions or Citations. Would he be at making such a fine inference as this? Bishops were Superiour to *Presbyters* in the second or third Centuries; therefore in this Centurie Bishops should have absolute Power, or at least a Negative Voice in the *Presbytery* I'm afraid this way of arguing would be look'd on as weak and Sophistical.

Yet

† Consulis Imperium hic primus savaſque ſequitur
Accipiet.

Yet it seems he does argue after this manner. (as also Mr. C. and many others of the Party) for in *P. 65*, after he has warn'd any, who may undertake to answer his Book, not to nibble at incidental escapes, but to grapple with the main design of his Writing, he adds, *It can do no substantial Service to the Presbyterians, to prove, that he has sometimes mistaken the meaning of a Citation, or fail'd in point of reasoning, so long as this Proposition stands firm, THAT IN CYPRIAN'S TIME THERE VVAS A PROPER PRELATION OF A BISHOP OVER PRESBYTERS.* This is fairly to insinuate, he has gain'd his Point, if it remain proven that a Bishop was any way Superiour in Power to a *Presbyter* in *Cyprian's* time. And what is his Point, pray, which he makes it his business to prove? It is this, That a Bishop is an absolute Monarch, or at least should have a Negative Voice in the *Presbytery*. So that, if what he says be put in mode and figure, it will amount to such a Syllogism as this, Whatever Power the Bishop had in *Cyprian's* time, that may the Prelate now claim; but in *Cyprian's* time the Bishop was Superiour to a *Presbyter*; Ergo, the Prelate now may claim to Absolute Power; which will not follow. Any Person may easily perceive, it will not follow, the Bishop should have absolute Power now, or even a Negative Voice, from this, that there was a proper Prelation of a Bishop over *Presbyters* in *Cyprian's* time.

But to do *J. S.* justice, tho his Conclusion, *That the Bishop should have absolute Power*, will not follow from his Premises in this place, it will follow from what he advances afterward, if it be solid, where he endeavours to make it appear by Terms, Phrases, &c. in *Cyprian's* Writings, that the Bishop actually had such Power in the 3^d Centurie. Wherefore 'tis reasonable to think, that his deducing such a large conclusion in this place from such narrow Premises, should be attributed to inadvertency rather than design.

But

But I'm sorry we can't say so with respect to Mr. C. who concludes without hesitation, that such *Episcopal* Government, as he describes, was universally received in the Church in the second Centurie, because some *Presbyterian* Divines grant, there were Bishops in that Centurie, or that Bishops then were in some things Superiour to the *Presbyters*.

However, seeing *J. S.* makes it his business to prove, that the Bishop in *Cyprian's* time had absolute Power, and consequently, that the Bishop should have such Power now, I understand not what could induce him to affirm, and to endeavour so laboriously to prove, contrary to his own avowed Principles, that, *Whether a Church should be Rul'd by Pastours acting in parity or imparity*, is the † only state of the Question between the *Presbyterians* and *Prelatists*; unless it be said, he suspected the Arguments he had to prove, the Bishop had absolute Power in *Cyprian's* time, were infirm, and therefore in stating

B the

† *J. S.* is in a great mistake, if he think that is the only state of the Question: The truth is, it is various according to the variety of Opinions among the *Prelatists*. It should be determined in the first place, of what extent the Diocess should be, whether the Bishop should be Pastour of one Congregation only. And if we have to do with these, who are of *Arch-Bishop Usher's* Principles, who allowed no more to the Bishop, but the Prerogative of being constant Moderator, the Question may be, whether a Church should be Rul'd by Pastours acting in Parity or Imparity? But if we be to dispute against these, who are for a Negative to the Bishop, the Question must be stated thus, Whether a Church should be ruled by *Presbyters* acting in parity, or by *Presbyters* acting in conjunction with a Bishop that has a Negative among them? And if *J. S.* had stated the Question accurately, according to his own Principles, it would have been after this manner, Whether a Church should be Ruled by a Bishop having absolute Power, or by *Presbyters*. &c. And if we be to dispute against the Government of the Church of *England*, the Question must be, Whether a Church should be Ruled by its *Presbyters*, or by a Bishop and Chancellour, Sub-chancellour, or Court of such Officers, excluding the Body of the *Presbyters*? It may be observed, that if the Question be put, Whether the Church was Rul'd in *Cyprian's* time by Pastours acting in parity or imparity? If by Pastour be understood one, who had the Pastoral Oversight of a distinct Church or Congregation (seeing all such Pastours were Bishops then) the Question will come to this, Whether the Churches should be Rul'd by Bishops acting in parity or imparity? But if by Pastours, the *Presbyters* of a Town, particular Church, Diocess, or Congregation, be understood, it may be said (in the words of *Malinæus*) That in the time of the Apostles, or soon after, it was appointed, that in one City or Church, one among the *Presbyters* should be call'd *Bishop*, and have a Preheminence among his Colleagues, to shun that Confusion, which is caused by Equality or perfect parity. And such an imparity there is among *Presbyters* in *Scotland* at this day.

the Question, would bring the Bishop's Power within as narrow a Compass as he could (and certainly, if any Power at all be left to him above the *Presbyters*, the lowest degree of Imparity is the very smallest measure or portion that can be thought on) that so the *Presbyterians* might have as little advantage as may be, and that the force of their Arguments might be directed, not against *Absolute Power*, which is easie to be overturned, but against *Imparity among Pastours*, which is a little thing only, and an ambiguous Expression, and cannot so easily be hitten. But I may say to *J. S.* That if the Bishops now will claim to no more Power, than what may be foundation for saying, that *they act in imparity with other Pastours*, (for I'm sure that their being constant Moderators in the *Presbyterie* or Synod, without any more, would be foundation enough for this) the two Parties might easily be brought to an Agreement.

In fine, when our Prelatists have proven with the greatest evidence imaginable, that the Bishops in the second Centurie were Superiour to *Presbyters*, had a Majority of Power, &c. they have done nothing at all, unless they make it appear they had then such a Superiority, or such a Majority of Power, as is now claimed to. *J. S.* endeavours indeed, as was said, to prove they had, at least in the *Cyprianick* times, but with what success will afterward appear. But neither *J. S.* nor any *Episcopal* Writer ever I heard of, offer to prove, or so much as to affirm, That the Bishop in the second Centurie † governed

† Perhaps there's as much reason to say, That in *England* they have wrested from the Bishop and *Presbyters* of the Diocess, that which *Cyprian* calls *Sublimis & Divina potestas gubernandi Ecclesiam*, and put it in the hands of the Chancellour of the Diocess, or Bishop's Court. And was that the Apostolical and Primitive way of governing the Church? Truly they would not have acted in greater opposition to the Principles and Practice of the Universal Church for many Ages, if they had discharged their Bishops and Pastours to dispense their Sacraments, and empower'd their Mid-wives to administer Baptism and the Lord's Supper publickly in all their Churches. Our Learn'd Country-man *B. Burnet* says, That as to the management of Ecclesiastical Jurisdiction, it is in the Church's power to cast it into what mould she will. But when he proves that, I shall prove, she may cast the Sacraments as to the Administration of them into what mould she will, in

verned his Church by a Chancellour, Sub-chancellour, or Court of such Officers, excluding the Body of the *Presbyters* of the Diocess. Wherefore the Church of *England* is deserted by all, and not one of her Sons has the confidence to lend her a helping hand: Yet some take upon them to say, That the Government of that Church comes nearest the Apostolical Pattern, little valuing that Wo which is denounced against those, who *call evil good, and good evil, that put darkness for light, and light for darkness.* *Isai. c. 5. v. 20.* To return to our Demonstrator.

Seeing the Demonstration is founded on the Acknowledgments of *Beza* and *Molinæus*; and seeing these Divines * acknowledge no such thing, as is pretended, the Demonstration has no foundation, and consequently cometh to nothing.

Yet least any should imagine the Bishops in the second Centurie had these 3 things, Mr. C. reckons essential to *Episcopacy*, tho perhaps they may be obliged to confess, that the Concessions of these or other *Presbyterian* Authors cannot be so far stretched, we shall make it appear in as few words as we can, That the Bishops had none of these Essentials in that Centurie.

B 2

CHAP.

like manner: And pray, when did the Church of *England* cast her Ecclesiastical Jurisdiction into this mould? I'm afraid the State did it whether the Church would or not. When the Question is stated, *Whether the Church or Diocess should be ruled by Pastours acting in parity or imparity*, the meaning is, Whether the Discipline of the Church (the inflicting Censures, Excommunication, absolving Penitents, &c.) should be managed by Pastours acting in parity or imparity? But seeing in *England* the Discipline of the Church or Diocess is managed neither by the Bishop nor *Presbyters*, but by the Chancellour of the Diocess and his Court, it is evident, that *whether the Church should be Rul'd by Pastours, acting in parity or imparity*, is a state of the Question that has no relation to the purpose. They may as well say, Whether the Bishop should wear horns on his head, is the state of the Question betwixt us. And if any Church or Nation should discharge their Pastours to administer the Sacraments, and imploy the Mid-wives in that work, that would be a more tolerable abuse, than is the discharging the Pastours to medle with the Discipline, and would not have such mischievous effects.

* If *Beza* and *Molinæus* grant, that the first Bishops were Pastours of more than one Congregation, what then? if the thing be not true, and if other *Presbyterian* Authors, noways inferiour to them, (e. g. *Blondel* or *Baxter*) confess no such thing.

C H A P. II.

The falsity of the first Proposition, which Mr. Chillingworth should have demonstrated, evidenced by making it appear, that the Ancient Bishops were Pastours of one Congregation only. Dr. Maurice's Exceptions answered.

THE first thing then that Mr. Chillingworth should have demonstrated to us, is; *That a Bishop in the second Centurie had many, or all the Churches within a certain Precinct or Diocess under his Charge.* This is not true. The Episcopal Church or Diocess consisted then but of one single Congregation.

Thus Ignatius, *one Altar*, i. e. Communion-Table, *to the whole Church, and one Bishop with the Presbytery, and Deacons my Fellow Servants.* Ep. ad Phil.

In vain does Mr. Dodwell tell us here, the meaning is, one Supream Altar with Inferiour Altars subordinate thereto. If it be said, that *one Altar* here signifieth one Supreme Altar, it must be said for the same reason, that *one Bishop with the Presbytery* signifieth one Supreme Bishop and Presbytery in every Church, with inferiour Bishops and Presbyters subordinate to them; there is no reason for taking *one Bishop* numerically, and *one Altar* otherways. For there is not one word, in the Authors of the first and second Centuries, of inferiour Altars subordinate to that of the Bishop. Further, this distinction is inconsistent with what the same Ignatius writeth to Polycarp then Bishop of Smyrna. *Let your Assemblies (saith he) be more frequent, enquire into all by Name, overlook not the Men and Maid-servants.* Seeing Polycarp could take personal Inspection of all within his Diocess, even the Men and Maid-servants, 'tis evident he could not have *inferiour Altars*, or more Congregations.

tions than one in his Diocess, to enquire into all by Name, being a sufficient task to one who has a Diocess like a *Scotish Presbyterian* one. And seeing *Polycarp*, as we are told, was a Metropolitan, we may safely conclude, that all the Bishops in the World then had Diocesses of no other kind.

This is a truth so evident, that it is confess'd by as Learn'd and Eminent Men, as the *Episcopal* Party can let us see on their side. I instance only two, the late Bishop of Worcester and Mr. *Joseph Mede*.

Saith Mr. *Mede*, *It should seem, that in those first times, before Diocesan were divided into lesser and subordinate Churches, we now call Parishes, and Presbyters assigned to them, they had not only one Altar in one Church or Dominicum, but one Altar to a Church, taking a Church for the Company or Corporation of the Faithful, united under one Bishop, and that was in the City and Place where the Bishop had his Residence.* D. *Maurice* would disable this Evidence, because Mr. *Mede* expresses it with caution and modesty, *it should seem*. But, as says a very ingenious Author, "Such modesty makes it more valuable, being the humour and way of that Learned Man; he had made as strict Researches into these things as he could, and upon the whole it seem'd thus to him; but if there was a more than ordinary Caution observed in the words, some will be apt to think, it was not for want of Evidence that the Case was really so, but rather because he knew the Notion would not be very agreeable to the Governours of that Church, of which he was an excellent Member. †

As plainly does the Bishop of *Worcester* declare his Opinion in these words: "For altho when the Churches increased, the occasional Meetings were frequent in several Places, yet still there was but

one

† The Learn'd Mr. *Dodwell* doubts not it was *Mede's* Opinion, that an Ancient Diocess was but one Congregation; wherfore he saith (one Altar, &c. p. 38.) In vain does Mr. *Mede* gather from hence, that there was then only one Communion-Table in the Bishop's house. But it seems the Doctor can deny what he pleases.

14 *An Answer to Mr. Chillingworth's*

“ one Church, and one Altar, and one Baptistry, and one
 “ Bishop, with many Presbyters assisting him. And
 “ this is so very plain in Antiquity, as to the Church-
 “ es planted by the Apostles themselves, in several
 “ parts, that none but a great Stranger to the Hi-
 “ story of the Church can ever call it in question.
Serm. on Misch: of Sep. p. 27.

Dr. Maurice telleth us here, we must needs be in great straits, seeing we have recourse for help to a Book that was designedly written against us.

But are we not, think you, in great straits, when we have one of our ablest and most learned Adversaries fairly giving up the whole Cause to us, confessing plainly, that the Primitive Bishops were only Pastours of one Congregation, and declaring, that none but ignorant Persons, and these who are wholly Strangers to the History of the Church, can doubt of such a manifest truth? But he was in a mistake, for neither Mr. *Dodwell* nor the Doctor are Strangers to the History of the Church; yet they *call in question*, and positively deny this evident Matter of Fact, which in the Learn'd Bishop's Opinion is so very plain in Antiquity:

Then the Bishop tells us, it was reckon'd an extraordinary thing in *Epiphanius's* time (who died in the 2d or 3d year of the 5th Centurie) that there were several distinct Congregations in the Diocesses of *Rome* and *Alexandria*; whereupon he concludes, that it is probable, that all the *Episcopal* Diocesses in *Crete* were but Congregational Churches even in *Epiphanius's* time. †

But

† It is true after some time, in the greater Cities, they had distinct Places allotted, and Presbyters fix'd among them; and such allotments were call'd Titles at *Rome*, and *Laure* at *Alexandria*, and *Paroches* in other Places: but these were never thought then to be new Churches, or to have any independent Government in themselves, but were all in subjection to the Bishop and his College of Presbyters; of which multitudes of examples might be brought from the most Authentick Testimonies of Antiquity, if a thing so evident needed any proof at all. And yet this distribution even in Cities was so uncommon in these elder times, that *Epiphanius* takes notice of it as an extraordinary thing at *Alexandria*; and therefore it is probably supposed there was no such thing in all the Cities of *Crete* in his time.

But tho these two Great Men had had as little regard to truth as some others, we had not been in the least straitned; this point is capable of such ample probation, that no room can be left for doubting. How can it be doubted, that Bishops were only Pastours of one Congregation in *Ignatius's* time, seeing they were generally such (to say no more) long after, when Christians were vastly multiplied, and Churches or Diocesses enlarged beyond what they were in *Polycarpus's* or *Ignatius's* time? I mean in the days of *Constantin*, when *Paulinus* was Bishop of *Iyre* the Metropolis of *Phœnicia*, and whose Bishop had the Precedencie of all the Oriental Metropolitans, next to the Patriarch of *Antioch*. For with respect to this, *Paulinus* the Panegyrist (in his Oration at the Dedication of the new built Church of *Iyre*) has these words: Unto this Person alone therefore be it lawful next after the Chief and principal High-Priest, (i. e. Christ) if not to have the first, yet to have the second place at least, in looking into, and taking care of the very inmost recesses of your Souls, * for by help of experience and long time, he has both made accurate inquiries into every particular person among you, and also by his Care and Industrie has instructed you all in modestie, in the Doctrine, which is according to Godliness, and he is abler than any one else to give such account, &c. † Thus you see, that *Paulinus*

Eusebius
Ecclesi.
Hist. lib.
10. cap. 4.

Stillington M. sch. of Separat: p. 28. So that Episcopal Diocesses, consisting of more than one Congregation, were Rarities in *Epiphanius's* time, i. e. toward the end of the 4th Centurie.

* And thus *Nazianz. Orat. 1.* speaking of the work of a Bishop, says, It is principally taken up about the hidden man of the heart: *ἡμῶν δὲ τοῦ κρυπτοῦ τῆς καρδίας ἀνθρώπων ἢ πάντα θεράπευα τε καὶ ἀπεδῆ.* But when the Pastours became Bishops of many Congregations, they would be forced to refer the care of the hidden man of the heart to others, else it would be badly taken care of, and cured.

† Let nor the Presbyters or Deacons do any thing without the Bishop, for the People of the Lord are entrusted to him; and there shall one day be required of him an account of their Souls. *Can. Apost. 40.* If the Bishops now believed this, they would think, that the Charge of one Congregation is a burden heavy enough. And, says *Dr. Taylor*, He is sure, we cannot give an account of those Souls, of whom we have no notice. *Presb. Treat. of Rep. A. p. 110* quidem *eccl. sic collata ad Orientem versa, in medio atem, tum*

linus, who was Bishop of one of the most considerable Diocesses in the World, in the 4th Centurie, made inquiries into every particular Person under his Charge, was acquaint with the inmost recesses, or Spiritual state of their Souls, and instructed them all in the Doctrines of Religion. Wherefore it is evident, that the Diocess of *Tyre*, as considerable as it was, was but one Congregation in the 4th Centurie. And therefore we have reason to conclude, that, generally speaking, the *Episcopal* Diocesses even in the 4th Centurie, were but Congregational Churches. If *Rome*, *Alexandria*, *Carthage* and *Antioch* be excepted,

Episcopi solum, & utrinque sedeat Presbyterium, & adstent Diaconi expediti ac leviter insulti, Laici omnino quiete & ordinatim sedeant. Cumque recitabitur Evangelium, omnes Presbyteri & Diaconi, Universusque Populus magnocum silentio stent, acinae Episcopus Populo pacem precatus benedicat ei. Const. Apolt. Lib. 2. Cap. 57. That is, Let the Church or House be long, built towards the East; let the Bishop's Throne be set in the middle of it, and the Presbyters sit on both sides of the Throne or Pulpit; let the Deacons stand ready, in a slight and easy dress: let the People sit in order, without noise. When the Gospel is read, let all the Presbyters, Deacons, and the whole People stand in great silence, then the Bishop having prayed, let him bless the People. They are very blind, who do not perceive here, that the *Episcopal* Church was one Congregation; that all the Presbyters, Deacons, and People of the *Episcopal* Church or Diocess, used to assemble for publick Worship in one House, in the days of the Author of these Constitutions.

Tho these Constitutions are falsely ascribed to *Clement*, it cannot be doubted that they are very ancient, and contain a description of the state of the Church, in the time in which they were written. And the less ancient they are, the more they make for our purpose. Thus *Baron Pop. Supr. p. 128.* "The Apostolical Constitutions, a very ancient Book, and setting forth "the most ancient Traditions of the Church. And says the same Author, "They describe the state of the Church, its Customs and Practices current "in the time of the Compiler. And *Du Pin*, They contain many things very "useful to the Discipline. Consult also *Dr. Beverige*. This to let you see what *Dr. Maurice* says about them, being much strained by them, is little to be regarded. He says, the Author was a Cheat, and so deserves no credit at all. But will it follow, that because the Author of these Constitutions set them out under a borrowed Name, that he might gain more Authority to them, therefore there is not one word of truth in them? To pretend such a thing is ridiculous. Neither is it easy to conjecture, what could have induced this Author to represent the *Episcopal* Diocesses in his time as Congregational Churches. contrary to Matter of Fact; Persons who propose Fictions, use to do it for some reasonable end, at least they will take care, that the Fictions they advance have some resemblance of truth, that they be such, that the falsity of 'em probably will not easily be discovered, especially in their own time. But if the Diocesses were such then, as *Dr. Maurice* fancies, the Fiction was too palpable, nay notoriously senseless; and the Author could propose nothing rationally thereby; but the causing of himself be looked upon as a Villain or mad Man by every body. If you add to this Consideration, that *Ignatius*, *Cyprian*, *Eusebius* and other Writers, who can come under no suspicion, with respect to this particular, represent them the same way, it will be found absurd to suspect this Author with respect to this Point.

pted, perhaps there was not a more considerable Church in the World then, than that of Tyre.

Before we proceed further, let us hear what Dr. Maurice has to offer against what is said. He answers, first, "That it is usual in Panegyricks to raise things beyond Nature, and the strictness of Truth. What therefore, if *Eusebius* by all this Citation should intend only to commend the diligence and penetration of that Bishop of Tyre, that he had the Gift of discerning Spirits, and of judging aright whose Repentance was sincere, and therefore to be received into Communion, whose Conversion was unfeigned, and therefore to be admitted unto Baptism † &c. they are to blame who would force a complement into a syllogism.

This answer is noways satisfactory. For whatever liberty may be allow'd to a Panegyrist, in raising things beyond Nature, he is still tied to Matter of Fact, that is, he must not venture to coin stories, invent Romances, or advance things never heard of, to heighten the glory of his Hero. * *Ut neque vera laus ei detracta Oratione nostra, nec falsa afficta esse videatur*, says *Cicero* very rationally, in a Panegyrick upon Pompey. i. e. That nothing may be detracted from his due praise by our Oration, and that nothing may seem to be added thereto beyond Matter of Fact. Here the Orator tells us, what great things Pompey did in *Italie, Sicilie, Africa, Gallia* and *Spain*; and perhaps he might take the liberty to hyperbolize, and make the things he did in these Places appear greater than they were really. But if he had advanced

† The Learn'd Dr. destroys his Hypothesis by this very Answer. For it is not possible to a Bishop, to judge of the sincerity of the Repentance and unfeignedness of the Conversion of all in a Diocess or the modern fashion: (and what Bishop troubles himself with such a work?) this is what can't be done without personal acquaintance, and careful Observation of People's Conversation for a long time.

* It is said to the commendation of Basil and Gregory Nazianzen. ῥητορικῆς δὲ τὸ τὴν φράσιν καλῶς ἀπανθιστάμενοι, τὸ ψαῦδος ἐξελκίναν. Verborum elegantiam decerpserunt, mendacia vitaverunt. In Vita Nazianzen.

ced Fictions, and added to Matter of Fact, had gravely told the *Roman* People, that *Pompey* subdued the Empire of *China*, and made it tributary to the Common-wealth, made *India* or *Ethiopia* subject to them, conquered the Isles of *Britain*, or the like, what would that have been, but to ridicule *Pompey*, and to expose himself to laughter?

But our Doctor is not ashamed to say, that *Eusebius*, a very grave Person, entertain'd the Christians of *Tyre* with such Fictions as these. He might indeed set off *Paulinus's* actions with all the advantage he could, and carry things to as great a height as decency would allow (for there must be a *decorum* observed in these things, else our Panegyrick will be look'd on as flatterie, and become the most nauseous stuff in the world) but to fancie he would say, that *Paulinus* took care of, and look'd into the very inmost recesses of the Souls of the People in his Diocess, when it was evident to every one, that this was altogether impossible; or, that he made accurate inquiries into every particular Person among'em, whereas he never attempted any such thing, more than did *Pompey* the Conquest of *China* or *Ethiopia*; and that he instructed them all with care and modestie, when it was notoriously known he never instructed the hundred part of them, or but one Congregation in a large Diocess, appears something extravagant. If this Doctor should say in a publick Speech, that the Bishop of *London*, by help of experience and long time, hath both made accurate inquiries into every particular Person in the Diocess of *London*, and instructed them all with care, &c. and give out, he intended no more by all this, but to commend that Bishop's diligence, in looking after the People belonging to the Cathedral Church, or doing any thing a Man is able to do among such a vastly numerous People; he would be thought a very odd sort of a Panegyrist, and I'm afraid, fitter to make speeches in *Bedem*, than any where else. The

The Doctor further tells us, that *Eusebius* says not the least word, that *Paulinus* had but so many under his Charge, that he could look into all their Souls. This is a mistake. *Eusebius* says, that he look'd into all the Souls of his Flock or Diocess; but if the Doctor will affirm, *Paulinus* had more Souls under his Charge, than belong'd to the Diocess, or were counted his Flock, I can't help it.

Then adds our Doctor, *Eusebius* says only, it was lawful for *Paulinus* to do so, to be an Inspector or Bishop of their Souls, not that he was so actually. This is another mistake; *Eusebius* says not only, it was lawful, but that actually by help of experience and long time, he had both made accurate inquiries into every particular Person, and instructed them, &c. And he says, he it lawful, because *Paulinus* alone had the Episcopal Oversight of them, and was accountable for their Souls, which no other Bishop was. And if the thing was impossible, how came it into *Eusebius's* head to say, it was lawful for *Paulinus* to do it? he might as well have said, it was lawful to him to move the Earth out of its place.

It seems the Doctor, tho he might be of Opinion, that this answer might contribute to the darkning of the Point, or the obscuring of this Passage of *Eusebius*, and the blinding of the eyes of some, yet was not satisfied with it himself; wherefore he propones another quite contrary thereto: telling us, that *Eusebius* was directing his Discourse to these only of the Diocess, who fell in the Persecution, and were in the state of Penitents, and that it is with respect to them, that *Eusebius* commendeth the discretion of the Bishop, that he can see into the secrets of their hearts, &c.

There is as little truth in this, as in what he said before. The Discourse of *Eusebius* is directed not to these only, who fell in the Persecution, but to the whole Flock, or People of the Diocess. *ἀλλὰ καὶ*

ὑμῖς ὁ τῆς ἱερᾶς ἀγγελίας χρεῖς θερέματα: And you O Sheep of the holy Flock of Christ; and then followeth the Passage in debate, *Unio ihu Person alone therefore be it lawful, &c.* without the interposition of so much as one word, that has particular respect to these, who were in a state of Penitents among them.

Then *Eusebius* addeth a little after, that *Paulinus* builded that Church at a great Expence; *You having contributed liberally* toward the defraying of it, to wit, *you* the inmost recesses, of whose Souls he looked into, and took care of, &c. And I hope no Person will imagine that Church was built at the Expence of these allennarly, who were in a state of Penitents at that time, it being undeniable that the whole People of the Diocess contributed for that end.

Thus it remains evident, notwithstanding all this Doctor is able to say, that *Paulinus* Bishop of the great Metropolitcal Church of *Tyre*, even in the 4th Centurie, was but a Pastour of one single Congregation.

And from what *Eusebius* says with respect to this *Paulinus*, it is easy to judge what should be thought of that Gloss the Author of the Case of the *Episcopal* Clergy in *Scotland*, puts upon the fore-cited Sentence out of *Ignatius's* Epistle to *Polycarp*: In-

Part. 2d.
page 25.

quire after all by Name, neglect not the Men and Maid-servants. "The Bishops in *Bohemia*, " (saith he) had Catalogues of all within the Paroches of their respective Bounds, and took care to know them, &c. It is evident enough from what is said with respect to *Paulinus*, that the care which the Bishop took of the Persons belonging to his Flock, was quite another thing than a keeping a Catalogue of their Names: It was an *instructing* them all with care; it was a making accurate inquiries into every particular Person among 'em, and an acquainting himself with the state of their Souls. Could the
Bishops

Bishops in *Bohemia* do this? I trow this is as much as the *Presbyterian* Bishops can get done in their Parochial Diocesses. What an easy task is the *Episcopal* Office made now by this rare invention? And how childish were *Naxianzen's* and *Chrysostom's* Flourishes anent the laboriousness thereof? But pray, good Sir, what the better would the People in the Diocess of *London* be, if the Bishop should have a Catalogue of all their names in his pocket, and should take care to know them, if this were possible to any Man? When *Peter* said, *Feed the Flock of God which is among you, taking Episcopal Inspection thereof*, ἐπισκοπῆντες, intended he no more but the keeping of a Catalogue of their Names? And tho each Pastour were obliged to acquaint the Bishop of *London* twice a month with the state of his Paroch, (as he says the Pastours of *Bohemia* did) yet what a general and superficial kind of Episcopal inspection would this be, and how far from Bishop *Paulinus's* way, who looked into, and took care of the inmost recesses of the Souls belonging to his Flock?

I suspect some will be ready to think, that what this Author says here, and *J. S.* in the 7th Chap. of his *Vindiciæ* says about Popular Elections, looks something like that, which the Apostle calls *detaining the truth in unrighteousness*, and that these Writers could not but be conscious, they were dealing deceitfully, when they were setting themselves to invent such gross and palpable delusions. But to return to our Doctor,

I confess, I have no inclination to examine all the Answers he makes to worthy Mr. *Clarkson*, in his large Tractat in defence of Diocesan Episcopacy (tho I believe, that would be a work more tedious than difficult) yet I think it will not be amiss to consider one other Point in Controversy betwixt them, with respect to which he triumphs over him extraordinarily, branding him with notorious disingenuity; and

and we do it so much the rather, because it is to the purpose in hand. It is this.

Mr. *Clarkson* affirms, that *Barses* and *Eulogius* (*Monks*) were ordain'd Bishops, and had no other Diocesses but the Monasteries in which they lived, and cites *Sozomen* for his Author, declaring in his Historie, they were made Bishops not of any Town, but were ordain'd in their own Monasteries. Whereupon our Learn'd Doctor, as if Mr. *Clarkson* had been one of the most dis-ingenuous Persons that ever put Pen to Paper, tells us with the greatest confidence imaginable, that "If the Author (Mr. *Clarkson*) had transcribed but two words more out of *Sozomen*, he had spoil'd all his Argument." But because nothing goes more against the Conscience of a Dissenter, than ingenuity, out of tenderness to that infirmity, I will supply the omission. *Sozomen* does indeed say, that these were not made Bishops of any Town, but only for honours sake, and as it were by way of recompence for what they had done; these then were only *Titular* or *Honourary* Bishops, according to this Historian, and therefore of little use to prove what was the measure of Primitive Diocesses.

That we may vindicate Mr. *Clarkson*, and that you may see the way and manner of this Doctor, we shall set down the whole Passage out of *Sozomen*, as it is translated by *Valesius*, which is thus: *Barses also and Eulogius, who afterward were made Bishops both of them, not of any Town indeed, except for honour's cause only, in recompense of their famous Actions, being ordain'd in their own Monasteries.* * Eccl. Hist. Lib. 6. C. 34.

That these Persons were ordain'd, is what can't be denied. The Question then between Mr. *Clarkson* and the Doctor will be about the nature of this Ordination.

* *Barses* item & *Eulogius* qui quidem ambo postmodum Episcopi fuerunt, non alicujus Urbis sed honoris duntaxat causa, tanquam ad repensanda praeclara ipsorum facinora, in suis Monasteriis Ordinati. *Valesius*.

Ordination. Says the Doctor, they were only Titular Bishops. Wherefore, according to him, they were ordain'd to the *Title* only, not to the *Office* of Bishops. That is, he would have us believe, that the Church at that time made a mock of Ordination, which is God's Ordinance, and made these Persons Bishops, in no other sense than the Emperour's Horse would have been Consul of *Rome*, They might as well have baptiz'd a Pagan to make him a Titular Christian. And say we, They were ordain'd to the *Episcopal Office*, and were made Bishops of their respective Monasteries †. (χειροτονηθέντες ἐν τοῖς ἰδιόχοις μοναστήριοις) and were hereby impowered to perform in these Monasteries all that work, which belongs to the Episcopal Office. And because it was not thought honourable enough, that these famous Persons should be stiled only *Bishops of Monasteries*; therefore each of them got the Title of some Town, and were stiled Bishop thereof: as some of our Nobles are stiled Duke or Lord of such a Town, (for honour's cause) in which they have no interest at all.

Famous Mr. *Dodwell* is of Opinion, that Ordination is that, which essentially constitutes or creates one a Bishop. Wherefore seeing these Monks were ordain'd, they were *real*, and not Titular Bishops only, and did really officiate as Bishops in their Monasteries, and consequently their Monasteries were really their Diocesses, tho they were not stiled Bishops of these Monasteries, but Bishop of some Town for honour's sake, or because that was thought a more honourable Title.

Where.

† If their Monasteries were not their Diocesses, their Ordination was *absoute* (that is, they were made Bishops without Bishopricks) which was not the custom then, and was forbidden by the Canons in the end of the 7th Centurie, when the Discipline was not by far so strict. If they had been ordain'd without Bishopricks, it had been no honour to them, but a disgrace in the Opinion of the Council of *Chalcedon*. *Paulinus*, afterward Bishop of *Nola* and *Jerome* were ordain'd Presbyters, without being fixed in a particular Church, but were not meer Titular Presbyters, as the Doctor fancies *Barjes* was a Bishop.

Wherefore the Doctor doth calumniously brand Mr. *Clarkson* with dis-ingenuity, because of omitting these words of *Sozomen*, *Except for honour's cause*; seeing it was only his business to shew, that these Monks were ordain'd Bishops of their Monasteries, but it did not at all ly in his way to inform his Reader, that these Bishops of Monasteries were for *honour's cause* stiled Bishops of certain Towns. A Writer should not be straight way branded with dis-ingenuity, because he does not inform his Reader about every circumstance belonging to a Passage he cites, it being enough if he give account of that, which has respect to the purpose in hand, and in which the Point he is handling, is concern'd. But it is evident, that it was nothing to Mr. *Clarkson's* purpose, that his Reader should know, whether these Persons were stiled Bishops of Towns, or Bishops of Monasteries, providing he was inform'd, that they were both of them Bishops of Monasteries, and had no other Diocesses.

C H A P. III.

The same thing is further evidenced by Arguments from Cyprian's Epistles, and Dr. Maurice's Exceptions taken off.

AS to the *Cyprianick* Age, I hope to make it so evident, that the Bishops thereof were such as we have now in *Scotland*, or what we call Pastours of Paroches, that none will call it in question, but they who are biassed by interest, or education and unreasonable affection.

(1st.) All the People of the Diocess or *Episcopal* Church then used to be present at the Election of their Officers or Ministers. The Bishop was ordain'd in the presence of all the People he was to oversee, and in their sight. *And this we see, says Cyprian, descends from Divine Authority, that the Priest be chosen*
IN THE PRESENCE OF THE PEOPLE, AND IN THE SIGHT OF ALL. He was elected by the Suffrages of the whole Brother-hood. *Which we know, says Cyprian, was done among you, with respect to the Ordination of our Collegue Sabinus,*
FOR THE EPISCOPAL OFFICE WAS CONFERRED UPON HIM BY THE SUFFRAGE OF THE WHOLE BROTHERHOOD, and Judgment of the Bishops, who were present at the time. And again: Which was done cautiously and diligently, THE WHOLE PEOPLE BEING CALL'D TOGETHER.

Ye may see these Citations in the Author's own words afterward.

(2dly.) The Bishops alone us'd to preach for ordinar to the People. Neither let any, beloved Brethren, when he sees our People, chased away by fear of Persecution, or dispersed, be troubled that he sees not the Brethren assembled, and hears not the **BISHOP'S PREACHING, &c.** * This would have been to speak ridiculously, if where one Congregation heard a Bishop, 300 heard only the Presbyters preach, as now.

Cyprian. Ep. 58.

Thus *Ambrose*, who lived in the Age after *Cyprian*, says, *What is the Interpretation of Bishop but Superintendent, or one who looks from above? and is so call'd, especially because he sits in a high Pulpit in the Church, and so looks to all the People* †. **Ambr. de Dign. Sacra**
D Cap:

* Nec quisquam, Fratres dilectissimi, cum Populum nostrum fugari conspexerit metu persecutionis & spargi, conturbetur, quod Collectam Fraternitatem non videat, nec tractantes Episcopos audiat.

† Episcopus enim a cunctis indubitavit vocaris, præsertim cum ipso Nomine censis, si tamen actio concordet nomini, & nomen se societ acti-
 onis. Nam quid aliud interpretatur Episcopus nisi super-inspector? Ma-
 xime cum solio in Ecclesia editiore resideat, & ita cunctos respiciat, ut &
 cunctorum oculi in ipsum respiciant.

26 *An Answer to Mr. Chillingworth's*

Cap. 6. It will not be easy to make good sense of this, if it be supposed, that the Presbyters us'd to mount the Pulpit in *Ambrose's* time, and to preach ordinarily to the People, as well as did the Bishops. To the same purpose *Optatus*, or the Author of the 7th Book concerning the Schism: of the *Donatists*. He denies, that *Macarius* acted as a Bishop, because he made a Speech in the Church. *It is certain*, says he, *that he did speak to the People, but that he might warn them of some thing, NOT THAT HE DID PREACH, WHICH BELONGS TO THE BISHOPS.* Who dare say, that *Macarius* did salute the People, as the Bishops use to do? * *J. S.* will say, it was peculiar to the Bishop to lay on hands; it seems to preach was as peculiar to him in those days in the Church of *Africa*.

The truth is, it was the proper Notion of a Bishop to be a Pastour; and it is the principal work of a Pastour, and so of a Bishop, to teach and instruct the People. Thus *Ambrose*. *Seeing we could not shun the work of teaching, which the necessity of the Priesthood did lay upon us †.* And when *Nazianzen* was made a Bishop, desiring direction from *Basil*, he said to him in an Oration, *Tell what Pastures we must go to, and what Fountains, what Pastures must be avoided, and what waters, who should be rul'd with the staff, who with the whistle, when the Flock should be led forth to the Pastures, and when brought back, &c. †* And because the Bishop us'd to preach and instruct the People, therefore he was call'd *THE LIGHT OF THE CHURCH*. Therefore, says *Ambrose*,

* Locutum cum esse aliquid in Populo constat, sed insinuandi alicujus rei causa, non tamen tractandi quod est Episcoporum, -- quis vestrum audet dicere Episcoporum more *Macarium* Populum salutasse? Igitur cum nec salutaret antequam aliquid loqueretur, nec salutare ausus sit postquam locutus sit, nec manum imposuerit, nec sacrificium Deo ritu Episcoporum obtulerit, &c.

† Cum jam eifugere non possumus officium docendi, quod nobis refugientibus imposuit sacerdotii necessitudo.

‡ Dic quæ pascua petenda, qui fontes adeundi, ac rursum quæ pascua vitanda, qui latrices: qui baculo regendi, qui fistula: quo tempore ad pascua ducendus Grex, & quo rursus a pascuis revocandus, &c. *Orat. 7.*

*Ambrose, if God has appointed the Bishop to be the Light of the Church, that by the shining eloquence of his Sermons he may enlighten the recesses of the conscience, and dispel the darkness of ignorance, &c. ** The same thing to the Church that the eye is to the body †, The Church's Lantern, *the Bishop is the Lantern of the Church*, says *Nazianzen*, Epist. 22. †

And very true it is, what *J. S.* saith p. 266, that the ancient Bishop was not like our Moderator, who has a Pastoral relation but to one Congregation within the bounds of the *Presbytery*; for all the People of the Diocess were committed to his Charge, and however many Presbyters there might be, the Bishop was Pastour of all the People the Presbyters had relation to. The Diocess was *Plebs sacerdoti adunata*, a People united to the Bishop; the Church, *Grex Pastori adhærens* ¶, a Flock adhering to its Pastour the Bishop. The Bishop was *the Light of the Church*, and not of one Congregation thereof only: he preached to all the People of the Diocess: *Let the Bishop* (says *Ambrose*) *so excel in wisdom, that he may not only sufficiently teach the People that are intrusted to him, &c. (*)* That is, he did teach and instruct all the People in his Diocess, for all the People in the Diocess were intrusted to the Bishop, Where-

D 2

fore

* Ergo si lux est Ecclesiæ Episcopus a Domino Ordinatus, ita ut imperitiae tenebras prædicationis suæ eloquio rutilante conscientiarum latebras illuminet, &c. *De dign. Sacerd. Cap. 6.*

† Oculorum etiam in corpore Officium, i. e. in Ecclesia, voluntarius appetiit, ut reliquum per te corpus ducatum lucis haberet, & nunc quadam lippitudine & caligine vitiorum obtenebratus, nec te ipsum luci idoneum præbes & aliis adimis lumen. *Ibidem.*

‡ Λύχνος δὲ τῆς ἐκκλησίας ἐπίσκοπος, ὁ δῆλον ὑμῖν καὶ αὐτοὶ μὴ γράρων. Epist. 22.

¶ Ecclesia tamen a Christo non recedit, & illi sunt Ecclesia Plebs sacerdoti adunata, & Pastori suo Grex adhærens. Unde scire debes Episcopum in Ecclesia esse, & Ecclesiam in Episcopo, &c. *Cypr. Ep. 65. p. 168.* Here you may take notice of the ignorance of these, who say, that the Bishop is properly Episcopus Pastorum, and the Presbyters Episcopi Gregis. You see, that the *Cyprianick* Bishop was Episcopus Gregis, Pastour of the Flock or People.

(*) Sic polleat Episcopus sapientia, ut non solum Creditum sibi Populum sufficienter doceat - ne sua imperitia imperitos minime doceat, & hujusmodi causa præventus, eveniat illi quod scriptum est, Cæco cæcus ducatum præbens, ambo in foveam cadunt. *De dign. Sacerd. cap. 4.*

fore the Bishop's Diocese was but one Congregation, or could be no other thing, than what we call a Paroch.

And hence it is evident, that one Man cannot be a Bishop of many Congregations. He can't be a Pastour to them, it is not in the power of any one to perform the duties of the Pastoral Office to many Congregations, or more than one, he can't teach them, he cannot preach to them, he cannot be a *Light* or *Eye* to more than one. How ridiculous would it be to reckon the Bishop of *London* the *Light* or *Eye* of all the Congregations in that Diocese? Nothing more evident, than that each Pastour is the *Light* of the Congregation, in which he is fix'd by preaching to and instructing the same; and it can't be said, that the Bishop communicates any light to the Congregations of that Diocese, more than if he were set under a bushel. *Ambrose* says, *That in a Church where the Bishop is advanced, not by merit but money, the People are always weak and ignorant* *. Nothing could have been said more childish, if then there had been many Congregations in every Diocese, having Pastours of their own fixed in them. If there had been many Congregations in *Ambrose's* Diocese, and every one of them provided with an able and learn'd Pastour, why might not the People have been well instructed and train'd up in knowledge, tho *Ambrose* himself had had been as ignorant as any child in the City of *Milan*.

Our Prelatists pretend, that the Bishop of *London*, for example, is real Pastour of all the Paroches and Congregations in that Diocese, (and pretend they must, or renounce all pretences to Antiquity, for the ancient Bishop was Pastour of his whole Diocese) and tho he can't preach to them all himself, yet he

* Ita ut videas in Ecclesia passim quos non merita sed pecuniæ ad Episcopatus Ordinem provexerunt, nugacem Populum & indoctum qui talem sibi asciverint sacerdotem. *De Dign. Sac.* c. 5.

he does this, and performs the other duties of a Pastour to them all, and feeds them by his Presbyters, as his Deputes.

It must be confessed, this is a very miserable shift; I need be at no pains, but that of transcribing an answer thereto, out of Dr. *Barrow's* Book against the Pope's Supremacy. *Bellarmin* said, that *Peter* might feed *Christ's* Flock partly by himself, partly by others. † And what says the Learn'd Doctor to this?

“ This indeed (says he) was an easy way of feeding; thus altho he had sleep'd all his time, he might have fed all the Sheep under heaven: thus any Man as well might have fed them; but this manner of feeding is, I fear, a latter invention, not known so soon in the Church; and it might then seem near as absurd to be a Shepherd, as it is now (in his own account) to be a just Man by imputation: That would be a kind of putative Pasturage, as this is a putative righteousness. However the Apostles, I dare say, did not take themselves to be St. *Peter's* Surrogates, but challenged to themselves to be accounted the Ambassadors of *Christ* himself, in whose Name they acted, &c. *Pope's* Suprem: p. 101, 102.

Might not the Bishop of *London* feed all the Congregations in *Britain*, nay *Europe*, the same way he pretends to feed the Congregations in that Diocess? might not any Trades-man in *London* feed these Congregations as well? is not that Bishop (or any other) a putative, not a real Pastour? If the Presbyters feed these Congregations in the Bishop's name, as his Substitutes, mult it not be said, that they are the Ambassadors, not of *Christ*, but of the Bishop of *London*? The Bishop is the Church's Light or Eye by

† Is it not a wonder, Dr. *Maurice* did not tell us, that the fore-mentioned *Paulinus* instructed all the Congregations in the Diocess of *Tyre*, and through help of experience and long time made accurate inquiries into the recesses of the Souls of that People, partly by himself, partly by others, viz. his Surrogates the Presbyters? He has made as sorry shifts.

by his Presbyters, by them he feeds all his Congregations; but, I fear, he would take it ill, if he were obliged to spend the Episcopal Revenue by the Presbyters too: he knows how to do that by himself.

But in process of time, when the Bishop's Diocess became so numerous, that it was not possible to the People to assemble as one Congregation, did not the Bishop divide his Diocess into distinct Congregations or Paroches, and set up a Presbyter, as fixed Pastour in every one of these Congregations, and were not these distinct Congregations still look'd on as parts of the Bishop's Flock or Diocess; and was not he looked on as Pastour or Bishop of these Congregations, having Sub-pastours, Surrogates, or Presbyters to preach and administer the Sacraments to them?

Very true. But I say with Dr. Barow, this was, I fear, a latter invention; for a Bishop to feed some Congregations of the Flock by Surrogates, was a thing not known in the first 3 Centuries, and was but very rare in the fourth. Secondly, this was their error. When a Bishop's Diocess did grow above the bulk of a Congregation, a new Diocess should have been erected, and a new Bishop set over it. Yet this was done upon the Matter; for when the Bishop erected a new Congregation in his Diocess, and constituted a Presbyter fixed Pastour thereof, he did *ipso facto* cease to be Bishop of that Congregation, and remain'd Bishop thereof nominally only, and with respect to the Emoluments and Revenue, and the Presbyter, who was made fixed Pastour thereof, became by being made Pastour of it, Bishop thereof really, tho nominated a Presbyter, and was perhaps still look'd on as such, and keep'd in dependance on the former Bishop.

Nevertheless it must be own'd, that when a Bishop had many Presbyters, and found himself obliged to set up some new Congregations in his Diocess, and

Pres-

Presbyters as fix'd Pastours in them; the Ancients were not so dull as to think, that these were no more but meer Presbyters, like the rest, or as they were before they became Pastours, they e'en knew, that these *Pastour-Presbyters* were really Bishops: and because they exerted the Office of Bishops in Villages or Country-places, therefore they were call'd *Chorepiscopi*. But some time afterward, when the pride and ambition of the Bishops did increase, they would have these Pastours of Congregations or *Chorepiscopi*, to be nothing but Presbyters, as formerly, contrary to sense and reason. For what could be more contrary to common sense, than to make these, who had an Episcopal Charge, and perform'd the work of the Episcopal Office, even the highest acts of the Priesthood (preaching of the Word and Administration of Sacraments) to reckon these, I say, nothing but Presbyters, or deny they were Bishops.

(3dly.) The Bishops alone did ordinarily administer the Sacraments; and if the Presbyters did it, it was but rarely, and in the Bishop's absence (a). The Bishop

(a) Unde intelligimus non nisi in Ecclesia Præpositis, & in Evangelica lege & Dominica Ordinatione fundatus, licere baptizare. Cyp. Ep. 73. p. 201. Aquam adituri, ibidem, sed & aliquanto prius in Ecclesia sub Antiquitatis manu contestamur nos renunciare Diabolo, &c. Tert. de Cor. Mil. C. 3. Eucharistiæ Sacramentum-- nec de aliorum manu quam Præsidium sumimus ibid. Et de Baptismo. Dandi quidem jus habet summus sacerdos qui est Episcopus, debinc Presbyteri & Diaconi, non tamen sine Episcopi Autoritate, propter Ecclesiæ bonorem. Cap. 17. And hence it seems to be evident, that an Episcopal Diocese then was but one Congregation: for in these Dioceses, where the Presbyters are fixed in Congregations of their own, they have the power of the Sacraments as well as the Bishops, baptize when they please, without consulting the Bishop in the affair, or expecting Orders from him: wherefore it can't be said, that they baptize by the Authority of the Bishop, as in Tertullian's time. They tell us, that the Presbyters are empower'd by the Bishop to baptize, viz. when he Ordains them, and therefore they baptize by the Authority of the Bishop. But this helps not the Cause, it can't be said for this, that the Presbyters in England baptize cum Episcopi Autoritate, as in Tertullian's time. Suppose all the Bishops in England were dead, and they should send over to France for a new Progenie, these would receive the power of Ordination, &c. from the Transmarine Bishops, as much as the Presbyters receive the power of Baptism from the present Bishops; but could it therefore be said properly, Ordinandi quidem jus habent transmarini, debinc & Anglicani Episcopi, non tamen sine transmarinorum autoritate? Wherefore Tertullian's meaning seems to be no other than this, That the Presbyters could not baptize but by express Orders from the Bishop *toties quoties*, or every time they were to administer that Sacrament. And hence we may say, it appears that the Diocese was but a Congregation, whereof

32 *An Answer to Mr. Chillingworth's*

Bishop administred the Sacraments to all in his Diocess, (b) and perform'd all the other work incumbent on the Pastour (c).

(4thly.) The whole People of the Diocess us'd to be present at the reading of Letters, which had any relation to the Discipline of the Church. Thus *Cyprian* wrote to *Cornelius* Bishop of *Rome*, He hop'd that he did not neglect to read his Letters to the most flourishing Clergy, (i. e. the Presbytery) who did preside or rule there together with himself, and to the most holy and numerous People (d).

(5thly.)

the Bishop was Pastour, on whom it was incumbent to administer the Sacraments, so that none could administer any of them without him, or express Orders from him, or when he was absent or the like. Neither can it be said, that the *Presbyters* baptize by the Bishop's Authority, because they are accountable to him, or are made so. Every particular Bishop is accountable to the Convocation, yet does not a Bishop baptize, &c. by the Convocation's Authority. (b) *Ut Sacramenti Veritatem Fraternitate omni præsente celebremus. Cyp. Ep. 63. p. 155.*

(c) *Omnium itaque curam gerat Episcopus, tum eorum qui non peccarunt ut tales esse perseverent, tum eorum qui deliquerunt ut pœnitentiam ducant. Ad vos enim dicit Dominus, videte ne contemnatis unum ex his pusillis. -- De omnibus esto sollicitus. Laicus enim sui tantum curam gerit, tu omnium, ut qui plus oneris habeas & majore pondere graveris -- quapropter tanquam de pluribus rationem redditurus, curam omnium sustine, ac sanos quidem conserva, eos vero qui peccaverunt increpa, jejuniisque atritos remissione leva, & ingemiscentem, universa precante pro eo Ecclesia, recipe, manuque impolita, permitte ut deinceps cum grege maneat. At somniculosos & ignavos versa, suffulci, incita, consolare, sana, edoctus quantam mercedem, si feceris hæc, capies; contra vero, quantum discrimen, si neglexeris. Nam Episcopos populum parvipendentes hunc in modum alloquitur. Ezek. Væ Papis, &c. c. 34. 2, Apost. Const. Lib. 2. C. 18. How is it possible, that a Bishop can do all these things in any Diocess but a Congregational one. --- Similiter Episcopus Laicos ut filios diligit -- cunctos admonens, omnes qui castigatione indigent lædens sed non illidens, ad conversionem premens non autem ad everisionem, suadens ad regressum, increpans ut corrigat & in viam rectam deducat --- Populum pacifice pascens, quod quassatum est roborans, h. e. quod tentatione conficitur admonitione consolidans, quod ægrotum est sanans, i. e. quod ex fide vacillante laborat, per doctrinam curans; quod contritum est ligans. h. e. quod vagum est vel collisum, vel ita peccatis contractum ut in via claudicer, per exhortationem consolatorium vinciens. --- Pars ergo modo, O Episcopo, & tu Deo obedientiam præsta, dum quod perierat requiris, quod aberraverat dirigis, quod secesserat revocas, potestatem enim habes revocandi. --- Pax autem & tranquillitas est potius Ecclesia Christi, ad quem peccatores absolvendos restitue sanos & immaculatos; bene sperantes, studiosos, in bonis operibus laboriosos: ut peritus & misericors medicus omnibus in peccato versantibus medere Matth. 9. 12. Luc. 19. 10. Cum ergo sis Ecclesiæ Domini Medicus, singulis ægrotis convenientem Medicinam adhibe, omni modo curâ, sana, sospites redde Ecclesiæ, pascere gregem, non imperiose, sed ut benignus Pastor. Certainly if this Man speaks of a Bishop of the modern fashion, he speaks like a mad Man.*

(d) Et quanquam sciam Frater Carissime, pro mutua dilectione quam debemus & exhibemus invicem nobis, florentissimo illic Clero tecum præstanti, & sanctissimæ atque amplissimæ Plebi legere te semper literas nostras Cyp. Ep. 59. p. 139.

(5thly.) The People us'd all to be present at Consultations and Debates about affairs of Discipline. (e)

(6thly.) All the People of the Diocess us'd to be present at the inflicting of Censures (f). In a word, nothing of any moment in Ecclesiastical Affairs was done without 'em (g).

Dr. Maurice meets us also in this place, and tells us, that *omnis Fraternitas, Stantes Laici, Plebe universa*, and the like, must not be taken in too strict a sense. He tells us, that *Jerome* says, that all the People of *Rome* came to the Funerals of *Fabiola*, that all the People in the Cities of *Palestine* came to that of *Paulina*; and produces many instances of this kind, and concludes, That tho there be great numbers of Congregations in a Church or Diocess, *whole Church, whole People, &c.* may be interpreted, *one Congregation of that Church*, (whatever is done in publick, says he, and before a Congregation, that is unlimited, is in the common way of speaking, said to be done by all the Community) or understood of *the Bishop's Congregation*. Thus, saith he, *Alexander* the Predecessour of *Athanasius* assembled the *whole multitude* in the Church called *Theonas*, the other Churches being all strait and little. Hence he gives us to understand that *whole Fraternity, Plebs universa, all the People, &c.* in *Cyprian's* Epistles, implie no more but *one Congregation* of that Diocess of *Carthage*, or the *Bishops Congregation*, tho there were many other Congregations in it.

E

True

(e) Deinde sic collatione Consiliorum cum Episcopis, Presbyteris, Diaconis, Confessoribus, pariter ac stantibus Laicis tacta, lapsorum tractare rationem. Ep. 30. p. 59. Cui rei non potui me solum Judicem dare, cum multi adhuc de Clero abientes sint, nec locum suum vel sero repetendum putaverunt, & hæc singulorum tractanda sit & limanda plenius ratio, non tantum cum Collegis meis, sed & cum Plebe ipsa universa. Ep. 34. p. 68.

(f) Et nagitarent ut Crimina quæ se asserere ac probare dicebant, publice a nobis & a Plebe cognoscerentur. Ep. 44. p. 85. Collegis meis, quibus presentibus, secundum Arbitrium quoque vestrum, & omnium nostrum commune Consilium, ea quæ agenda sunt, disponere pariter & limare poterimus. Ibid. Ep. 43. Conjuratæ suæ poenas soli subeant, qui olim secundum vestra suffragia sententiam malignitatis suæ subire meruerunt. Ep. 43. p. 84.

(g) statuerim nihil sine consilio vestro & consensu Plebis meæ privatum sententia gerere. E. 34. p. 33.

True it is, when *Ferome* says, *all* the People of *Rome* went to such a Woman's Funeral, no more can be made of the expression, but that a considerable number went (and so with respect to other expressions of this kind) to go to a Burial, being a Matter of indifferency, to which no Person was obliged but such as thought fit, and having no relation to Government. But will it therefore follow, that when it is said, the People of *Rome*, or whole multitude created such Men Consuls, or made such a Person Emperor, and sent him to such a Province with an Army, or against such a King; by People of *Rome* or whole multitude, we must understand *one Tribe* only of the *Roman* People? Were not *all* the *Roman* People equally concern'd in the Election of a Consul or Emperor, wherefore must it not be concluded, that these Elections were made by the Body of that People, and not by one single Tribe? And is not the Election of a Bishop the same thing to a Diocese or Church, that the Creation of a Consul or Emperor was to the Common-wealth of *Rome*? Wherefore, when it is said, for instance, that *Cyprian* was promoted to the Episcopal Office by the *Favour of the People* (b) or *Cornelius* by the *People's Suffrages*, tho' this does not necessarily include all the individuals in the Church, without exception (some might be absent, indispos'd, or some way taken up) yet must it be understood of the *Body* or Bulk of the People of the Diocese or Church, and not of one Congregation only, tho' there had been more than one in the Diocese: Unless ye will suppose that Christians then acted like Children, and not as rational Men, as the People of *Britain* would do, if the County of *Mers* or *Northumberland*, or their Deputies, should be permitted to choose a King and Parliament to both

(b) Will J. S. say, that *Paul* was advanced to the Apostolick Office by the *Favour of the People*? Certainly he had their *cheerful acceptance* and *cordial approbation*, as much as ever *Cyprian*. See *Vind: Princ: Cypri: Age*, p. 396.

both Nations: This Maxime of *Leo* Bishop of *Rome*, *Qui præfecturus est omnibus ab omnibus debet eligi*, being founded on Common Sense and Light of Nature.

In like manner all the *Stantes Laici*, all the People, the whole Brother-hood of the Diocess or Episcopal Church, were equally concern'd in the Case of the Lapsers, and other affairs of Discipline, as all the *Roman* or *Athenian* Citizens were in the publick Affairs of the Common-wealth. Wherefore, when *Cyprian* says to the People of *Carthage*, *That such affairs of Discipline should be determin'd according to their Arbitriment*, (*secundum arbitrium quoque vestrum & omnium nostrum commune consilium*) or *they being present and judging* (*præsentibus & judicantibus vobis*) or *that such Persons shall give account to himself, to the Confessours and to the whole People* (*acturi & apud nos, & Confessores ipsos, & apud Plebem universam, causam suam*) &c. *Whole People*, and *you being present and judging*, can no more be restricted to a part of the People of that Diocess, or one Congregation of it or two, than it can be said, when the *Carthaginians* made Peace with the *Roman* People, they made peace with as many of them only as would make up one Congregation, or when such a King made the *Roman* People his Heir, he made one Tribe only of that People his Heir; or when *Peter* said, Feed the Flock of God which is among you, his meaning was, Feed a part of the Flock, or one Congregation of it, being Ensamples to the Flock, being Ensamples to one Congregation of the Flock, &c.

And if any Person will cast his eyes upon *Cyprian's* Epistles, he will soon perceive the Doctor's Glosses will not quadrat. Take the 67th Epistle for an example. There saith *Cyprian*, *We should choose such Bishops as are immaculate, who may be hear'd in their prayers for the Salvation of THE LORD'S PEOPLE.* (i)

E 2

The

(i) Immaculatos Antistites eligere debemus, qui audiri in precibus possint quas faciunt pro Plebis Dominicæ incolumitate. *Ep. 67. p. 171.*

The Bishop prays not only for the Salvation of one Congregation of his People, but of all; wherefore *People* here must be understood of all the People of the Diocess. *Neither let the People flatter themselves, that they will be free from the contagion of the Crime, if they communicate with a vitious Priest, and assent to his unlawful Episcopacy. --- VVherefore a People fearing the Lord, and obeying his Commandments, should separate from a vitious Bishop, and should not partake in the Sacrifices of a Sacrilegious Priest, seeing they principally have the power either of electing good Bishops, or rejecting bad ones. (k) I hope, it will not be said, that a part only of the People of the Diocess should separate from the Sacrifices of a flagitious Bishop: wherefore, they principally have the Power, must be understood of all the People of the Episcopal Church. That the People being present, the Bishop be chosen in the sight of all. (l) That Episcopal Ordinations should not be but with the knowledge of the People assisting; that the People being present, the Crimes of the wicked might be detected, or the Merits of the Vertuous published, and so the Ordination might be lawful and accountable, being examined by the Suffrages and Judgment of all. It can't be suppos'd, that any of the Diocess were debarr'd from access to detect the Crimes of the Unworthy, which might be presented to Ordination; wherefore, the People being present, with the knowledge of the People assisting, implies the presence of all the People of the Episcopal Diocess. VVhich was done in a cautious way, the whole People being assembled, that no unworthy Person may creep into the Episcopal Office and*
Mini-

(k) Nec sibi *Plebs* blandiatur quasi immunis esse a contagio delicti possit, cum sacerdote peccatore communicans, & ad illicitum Præpositi sui Episcopatum consensum suum commodans. --- Propter quod *Plebs* obsequens præceptis Dominicis & Deum metuens a peccatore Præposito separare se debet, nec se ad Sacrilegi Sacerdotis Sacrificia miscere, quando ipsa maxime habeat potestatem vel eligendi dignos Sacerdotes vel indignos recusandi. *ibid.* (l) Ut Sacerdos *Plebe* præsentē, sub omnium oculis deligatur --- Ordinationes Sacerdotales non nisi sub Populi assistentis conscientia fieri oportere, ut *Plebe* præsentē vel detegantur malorum crimina, vel bonorum merita prædicentur, & sit Ordinatio justa & legitima quæ omnium suffragio & judicio fuerit examinata.

Ministry of the Altar. (m) This can't be understood of assembling a part only of the People. *Wherefore it is diligently to be observed, as descending from Divine Tradition and Apostolical Practice, which is also observed with us (in Africa) and commonly † in all Provinces, that for celebrating Ordinations aright, all the neighbouring Bishops of the Province DO MEET WITH THE PEOPLE TO WHOM A BISHOP IS TO BE ORDAIN'D, and that he be chosen, THE PEOPLE BEING PRESENT, who most perfectly know the life of every one, and have observed their behaviour by their Conversation.* (You see, the neighbouring Bishops did meet with the People to whom a Bishop was to be ordained, and he was ordain'd in their presence; but the Bishop was ordain'd not to one Congregation, or a part only, but to all the People of the Diocess: Therefore the neighbouring Bishops did meet with all the People of the Diocess, and the Bishop was ordain'd in the presence of them all) *Which course also we perceive hath been observed with you (in Spain) in the Ordination of our Colleague Sabi-*

(m) Quod utique iccirco tam diligenter & caute Convocata Plebe tota gerebatur, ne quis ad altaris ministerium vel ad sacerdotalem locum indigner obreperet. *Ibid.*

† Et fere per Provincias universus tenetur, &c. Gladly would J. S. make some advantage of this *fere*. If any Person think it importeth that the way of creating Bishops by Popular Voices was not universal in *Cyprian's* time, let him consider, (1) That *Cyprian* affirms, that this way of creating Bishops by the Voices of the People, which was the way in *Africke*, &c. in his time, is Divine and Apostolical, and therefore it matters not what was the custom of the Places this *fere* seems to except, seeing they deviated from the Divine Institution. (2) It is evident by abundance of Canons of Councils after *Cyprian's* time, that the way of promoting Persons to the Episcopal Office by Popular Elections, was universal. (3) What if *fere* was tossed into this Epistle by such Cheats as did put *Florentissimo Clero tecum illic praesentis* (in *Ep. 4. 59.*) in place of, *Florentissimo Clero tecum illic praesidentis*? J. S. imagines strongly, that the Bishop of *Alexandria* was elected by the Presbyters and not by the People, (p. 400) and this makes him fancy, *Jerome* affirms he was elected that way. *Jerome* says (*Ep. ad Evagr.*) *Presbyteri unum ex se electum & ex celsiore gradu collocatum, Episcopum nominabant.* But says not, the Presbyters themselves elected the Person to be Bishop. There was indeed a singularity (as J. S. observes) in the Promotion of the Bishops of *Alexandria*, before the times of *Heracles* and *Dionysius*, not that the Presbyters there elected that Bishop, contrary to the Custom in other Places, as J. S. says without ground; but it was this, that before that time the Bishops of that City were ordain'd by the imposition of the hands of the Presbyters; whereas in other Places such Ordinations were perform'd by the neighbouring Bishops.

Sabinus, who was promoted to the Episcopal Office by the Suffrage OF THE WHOLE FRATERNITY, and the Judgment of the Bishops, who assembled with them at the time, and laid hands on him in room of Basilides. (M) And many other instances of this kind may be made. In like manner, when he speaks of communicating Counsels with the Presbyters, Deacons, Confessors, and standing Laity, or the People that stood or had keep'd their integrity, no Person understands Presbyters or Confessors, of a part only of the Confessors and Presbyters of the Carthaginian Diocess; and neither would any take standing Laity in the very same Sentence, for a part only of the People of that Diocess, if they were not forced there-to by their own precarious hypothesis.

But says the Doctor, If we must conclude from such Phrases (*Plebe universa, universæ Fraternitatis suffragio, &c.*) that all the Faithful in Rome, without any allowance or exception, did meet in one place in the 3d Centurie, to choose a Bishop, and that therefore they were no more but one Congregation, it will follow from the same Phrase, that in the 4th, 5th and 6th Centuries, and so foreward, there was but one Congregation in Rome, after it was become Christian. For Gregory the Great is said to be chosen by all the People.

Certain it is, that Popular Elections continued in the Church long after the Diocesses consisted of many Congregations, and the Sacrilegious and detestable abuse of Patronages, was not well established many hundred years after the Throne of Satan was set

(M) Propter quod diligenter de traditione Divina & Apostolica observatione servandum est & tenendum, quod apud nos quoque, & fere per Provincias universas tenetur, ut ad Ordinationes rite celebrandas, ad eam plebem cui præpositus ordinatur, Episcopi ejusdem Provinciæ proximi quique convenient, & Episcopus deligatur Plebe præsentē quæ singulorum vitam plenissime novit, & uniuscujusque actum de ejus conversatione perspexit. Quod & apud vos factum videmus in Sabini Collegæ nostri Ordinatione, ut de universæ Fraternitatis suffragio, & de Episcoporum qui in præsentia convenerant Judicio, Episcopatus ei deferretur, & manus ei in locum Basilidis imponeretur. Ep. 67.

set up in the Temple. (n) But what method they followed in the Elections then, whether the Fraternity of the several Congregations us'd to assemble for that end, or whether afterward, when barbarity and ignorance prevail'd, the Election of the Bishop was permitted to the People of the Town where he was to reside together with the Clergy, or to the neighbouring Bishops, is what we are not much concern'd with. However there is no absurdity in holding that all the Faithful in *Rome* might assemble in one place to choose a Bishop in the 6th Centurie, seeing when the *Roman* People were ten times more numerous than then, they us'd ordinarily to meet for the Election of the Consuls and other Magistrats.

As to what he says further, If we conclude the Episcopal Diocesses were but Congregational Churches in the 3d Centurie, because the People elected their Bishops in that Centurie; we may for the same reason conclude, that the Diocesses were Congregational Churches in the 4th, 5th and 6th Centuries, and so on.

I answer, *First*, It is very likely that several Episcopal Diocesses, even in the 5th and 6th Centuries, were but Congregational Churches. The Doctor cannot prove, that all the Diocesses in these Centuries, without exception, consisted of many Congregations. *Secondly*, As to the Church of *Rome* in the 6th or 7th Centurie, (or other Diocesses then, which unquestionably consisted of many Congregations) the Author says nothing to the purpose, unless he can produce some Writer of good Reputation in that or the following Age, expressly affirming, that that Bishop was elected by all the People of the Diocess or Church, *assembled together in one place* ;
as

(n) The Council of *Rheims* in the 11th Centurie, at which Pope *Leo* the 9th was present, ordain'd, That none should be promoted to Ecclesiastical Dignities, but by the Election of the Clergy and People. And the 2d Gener. Council of *Lateran*, in the 12th Cent: deprives those Persons of their Benefices, who receive them from the hands of Lay-men. And many other Canons might be instanced.

as we can instance *Eusebius*, declaring, that *Fabianus* Bishop of *Rome* in the 3d Centurie, was chosen by all the Brethren of the Diocess, assembled together in one Church, (*For when all the Brethren were assembled together in the Church, in order to choose a Successor (o) viz. to Anteros Bishop of Rome*) to tell us in the general, that *Gregory the Great* was chosen by all the People, is nothing to the Cause; for we know not what method they followed in that Election: What if the several Congregations of that Diocess proceeded to *Gregory's* Election one after another? Thirdly, That the whole Fraternity of the Diocess used to assemble in one place, to choose the Bishop in the 3d Cent. is not the only thing we have to build on. The whole People of the Diocess then us'd not only to meet in one place for the Election of their Rulers, but constantly on all other occasions about affairs of Discipline, or Government of any moment; and this, together with the Bishop's performing daily all the duties of a *Pastour (p)* to the whole People of his Diocess, makes it evident, we think, to a Demonstration, that the Diocesses then were but Congregational Churches.

Mr. Clarkson saith, with respect to the Christians in *Rome*, They were no more after, viz. An. 250, than could altogether in the Church importune *Cornelius* for the re-admission of the Ordainers of *Novatian*. The whole People interceeding for him *παρατρεχόντες τὸ λαόν*. *Eus. l. 6. c. 43*. To which our Doctor answers, "Our Author (*Mr. Clarkson*) according to his usual ingenuity, has left out a word that spoiled his Argument, and limited this expression. For *Cornelius* does not say, that all the Christians in *Rome*

(o) Nam cum Fratres omnes Successoris ordinandi causa in Ecclesia essent congregati, ac plerique jam illustres aliquot & nobites viros eligendos esse conpererent, de Fabiano quidem nemo ne tantisper cogitabat. *Euseb. Eccl. Hist. l. 6. c. 29*.

(p) Qui Episcopus est, hic verbi est Minister, Scientiæ custos, Mediator Dei & Vestrum in Divino cultu, hic est Magister pietatis, hic post Deum facit vestrum. *Apost. Const. l. 2. c. 26. ab initio*.

“*Rome* importun’d him, but that all the People that
 “was present with him, did interceed *παντὸς τῆ πα-*
 “*ρόντος λαῷ.*

This is like the rest of the Doctor’s Observations: I wish he could be as easily clear’d of his dis-ingen-
 nuity, as Mr. *Clarkson* may. The meaning of *θεν-*
θεντος παντὸς τῆ παρόντος λαῷ, is not, that the bulk
 of the People being absent, these few only, who
 were present, importun’d him. But that all the
 People (not every individual without exception,
 but the main Body) being actually there present at
 the time, did importune him. What *Cyprian* saith,
 with respect to the Election of *Cornelius*, may give
 light to this. *Cornelius was made Bishop*, says he,
by the Judgment of God and of his Christ, by the Testi-
mony of almost all the Clergy, and by the Suffrages of
the People, who were then present. (q) Will any ra-
 tional Man think, *Cyprian* does not say *Cornelius* was
 elected by the Church of *Rome*, but by these only
 of that Church, who happened to be present at the
 time? At this rate, perhaps not the hundred part
 of that Church, concurr’d in *Cornelius’s* Election;
 at this rate a dozen or two of the meanest of the
 People might choose a Bishop to a numerous Dio-
 cesis, which would be near as absurd, as if the Town
 of *Glasgow* or *Hadingtoun* should take upon them to
 settle the Succession to the Crown of *Scotland*. More-
 over it is *Cyprian’s* design in that Epistle to justify
Cornelius’s Election to the See of *Rome*, against Pre-
 tenders, but would not the lawfulness of this Electi-
 on be bravely defended by *Cyprian*, if the Doctor’s
 Glosses be to be put upon his words? *Cyprian’s* mean-
 ing then can be no other than this, that the *Roman*
 Christians being actually present, did by their Suf-
 frages elect *Cornelius* to the Episcopal Office. And
 the meaning of *Eusebius* is no other, whose words

F

may

(q) Factus est autem *Cornelius* Episcopus de Dei & Christi ejus judicio.
 de Clericorum pene omnium testimonio, de Plebis quæ tunc affuit suffra-
 gio.

may be rendred thus, *The whole People being present did interceed for him.* Accordingly *Valesius* turns them thus, *Cum universus Populus pro illo intercessisset*, and takes no notice of the word *παρόντος*, because the whole People's interceeding with *Cornelius*, evidently supposes, they were present with him. Hence you may see, the Doctor is not to be regarded, when he accuses *Mr. Clarkson* of disingenuity.

Let it be further consider'd, with respect to the Church of *Carthage*, in *Cyprian's* time, that there is nothing to be found in the Epistles, or any of the Works of that Author, that may give us any ground to think, it had more Congregations than one belonging to it: on the contrary, as oft as he has occasion to mention it, or the People belonging thereto, he could not have expressed himself otherways than he does, if it had been one Congregation only. Thus in the Epistle he wrote to all the People of that Church, after he got notice, that the five Presbyters had separated and joined *Felicissimus* and his Faction, he says, *What a torment is it to me, that I cannot be with you at this time, to set upon you one by one, and to exhort you, &c?* (r) Is not this to speak of the *Carthaginian* Diocess as one Congregation? What a task would this have been, if it had been a Diocess according to the modern fashion, or had even had 8 or 9 Congregations belonging to it?

That Diocess had once 8 Presbyters belonging to it, and if the Bishop and Presbyters had every one of them distinct Congregations, seeing five of these Presbyters separated, there were five vacant Congregations in the Diocess, and but three Presbyters to supply both them and their own Paroches with preaching; yet neither the Bishop nor the Presbyters take any notice at all of such Vacancies, neither

he

(r) Quos nunc pœnas porior quod ipse ad vos inpræsentiarum venire non possum, ipse singulos aggredi, ipse vos secundum Evangelii Magisterium cohortari? Ep. 43. p. 83.

he nor the Presbyters expreſs the leaſt trouble they were in, upon the account of ſuch deſolations, or becauſe ſo many Congregations among them were living without the Word and Ordinances. It never enter'd into the head of any of the Presbyters, to conſult *Cyprian* when he was in his Retirement, what ſhould be done that theſe deſtitute Churches might be furniſh'd with preaching, till they were provided with Presbyters of their own, tho they uſ'd to adviſe with him about the ſmalleſt Emergencies. It never came into *Cyprian's* thoughts to ſend any word to the Presbytery anent the ſupplying theſe poor deſolate Churches, to give any ſort of direction about them, or to exhort them to preach to them now and then at leaſt, or as oft as they could conveniently get it done, tho oft times he ſends word to them, or directions about affairs of much leſs moment; an incredible thing if there had been ſuch Vacancies, conſidering the Piety, great Carefulneſs and mighty Zeal both of Biſhops and Presbyters in thoſe days. *Cyprian* does indeed intreat them to ſupply his own Pulpit, to preach and adminiſter the Sacraments in his abſence, which I take to be the meaning of his words, which you have in the margin, (/) but concerning the ſupplying of the other vacant Congregations (a thing which he ſhould not have neglected, if he had been an honeſt and faithful Miniſter) not one word in any Epiſtle.

Is it not ſtrange, that it never enter'd into the mind either of the Presbytery or Biſhop to uſe any endeavours, or to make even the ſmalleſt attempt to get theſe Churches planted with able and faithful Miniſters? eſpecially conſidering, that there were no troubleſome Patrons, or the like, concern'd

F 2

in

(/) Fretus ergo & dilectione & religione veſtra quam ſatis novi, his literis & hortor & mando, ut vos quorū minime illic invidioſa, & non adeo periculofa præſentia eſt, vice meā fungamini circa gerenda ea quæ adminiſtratio religioſa depoſcit. *Epiſt.* 14.

44 *An Answer to Mr. Chillingworth's*

in the Call of Ministers, to hinder the Plantation of Churches.

At least in the 43 Epistle, which was writ immediately upon receipt of the news of the Secession of the five Presbyters, we might expect to meet with something of this kind, with something relating to the Case of these Congregations, suppos'd to be deserted by their Pastours, but no such thing to be seen there, nothing that may give us occasion to think, that some of the People had a more peculiar Interest in these Presbyters than the rest, nothing to hinder us to believe, that all of'em were equally concern'd in them, as they were in the Bishop; or as one of our Paroches in the Consistory of Ruling-Elders, he drops not one word in the whole Epistle that has respect to the Circumstances of the five pretended Congregations: He laments not the inconveniencies they were lying under through want of their Pastours, and the dispensation of the Word and Ordinances among them; gives them no advice what to do; makes no promise to take care to get their Pulpits quickly filled with able and conscientious Ministers, in place of these who had turn'd their backs on them: And tho of all the People in the Diocess they were the most likely to be wrought upon, and prevail'd with to desert the Church, and to follow their own Pastours, who had join'd the Schismatical Faction. Yet *Cyprian* does not notice this in the least (as sagacious and sharp-sighted he uses to be on other occasions) takes no pains on them in particular, contenting himself to exhort them all in common to continue stedfast, to adhere to the Church, and not to be moved either by the Age or Authority of these Apostates. He complains in this Letter, that these Presbyters had long ago corrupted the minds of some of the Confessours, but speaks nothing of their attempting to seduce the Confessours within their own Congregations, which
not-

notwithstanding it is most likely they would have done, if they had had Congregations distinct from that of the Bishop, and these of the rest of the Presbyters.

When *Cyprian* was in his Retirement, he and his Collegues, or some Bishops who were with him at the time, ordained *Celerinus* Lector or Reader; he could not be Lector to all the 9 Paroches or Congregations in the Diocess of *Carthage*; is it not a wonder then, that when he sends word to the Presbytery, he had ordain'd such a one Lector, it did not enter into his thoughts to shew them which of the 9 Paroches he designed him for? This would have been an oversight bordering upon stupidity, if there was any such thing as distinct Congregations in *Carthage* at that time. *Cyprian* does indeed acquaint them, that *Celerinus* was mighty averse from being ordain'd (being conscious, it seems it was a wrong step to be thus ordain'd by *Cyprian* and the other Bishops, without the Presbytery and Call of the People) and that he and his Collegues could not prevail with him to comply, till the Church appear'd to him in a Vision by night, and exhorted him to be ordain'd by *Cyprian* and the rest: (which it seems the good Man looked on as equivalent to the Call of the People) *The Church*, says *Cyprian*, *Cui plus licuit*, that is, which could do more, or had more power than *Cyprian* and all the Bishops that were with him, & *quæ coegit*, *Cyprian* and the other Bishops could but exhort or advise, but the Church could compel, viz. any of her Members to accept an Office when call'd thereto: (1) But *Cyprian* gives them

(1) Exultate igitur & gaudete nobiscum, lectis literis nostris quibus ego & Collegæ mei qui præsentibus aderant referimus ad vos, Celerinum Fratrem nostrum, virtutibus pariter & moribus illustrem, Clero nostro non humana suffragatione, sed divina dignatione conjunctum. Qui cum consensu dubitaret, Ecclesiæ ipsius admonitu & hortatu in visione per noctem Communi fuit ut ne negaret nobis suadentibus, cui plus licuit, & quæ coegit. Epist. 39. p. 76. At igitur Cyprianus suavis quidem suo se Celerinum adoptasse in Clerum, Ecclesiam vero cui autoritas major, compulisse & coegisse. Regallius in Notis.

them no account which of the Churches or *Carthaginian* Congregations did thus appear to *Celerinus* in the Vision.

By the by, is it not very likely, think you, that *Cyprian* had a Monarchical and absolute power over the Church of *Carthage*, as *J. S.* pretends, when *Cyprian* himself declares in as plain and express terms as a Man can do, that the Church could do more, or *had more power* than he and all the Bishops, who were with him; that she could *compel*, whereas he and the Bishops with him could but *exhort*? This is a mighty Objection; and if *J. S.* had been a fair dealer, he would have endeavoured to clear this Point, which overturns the design of his whole Book, and makes it appear very evidently, that all his Arguments for the Episcopal Power or Monarchy are but idle Notions, a catching at the sound of Words, or undue stretching of some Expressions beyond the intention and design of the Author. (u) But to return to our purpose.

Cyprian adds, *Seeing he came to us so much favour'd of God, and renown'd by the wonderful testimony of his Persecutor, what could we do but set him on the Pulpit, that is the Throne of the Church, that being in a higher place, and conspicuous to the whole People, he may read the Gospel of our Lord, which he so faithfully doth follow?* (v) If there had been 9 Pulpits in the Diocess of *Carthage*, how comes *Cyprian* to speak of setting *Celerinus* on the Pulpit of the Church? Will *Mr. Dodwel* say, there was one supreme Reader's Seat, to which all the other Reader's Seats in the Diocess were subordinate? And if there was such a Supreme Reader's

(u) *Malo te ad sensum rei, quam ad sonum verborum exerceas. Tert. adversus Prax: c. 3.* This was not minded by *J. S.*

(v) *Hunc ad nos, Fratres dilectissimi, cum tanta Domini dignatione venientem, testimonio & miraculo ejus ipsius qui se persecutus fuerat illustrem, quid aliud quam super pulpitum, id est super tribunal Ecclesiæ oportebat imponi, ut loci altioris celsitate subnixus, & Plebi universæ pro honoris sui claritate conspicuus legat præcepta & Evangelium Domini quæ fortiter ac fideliter sequitur?* *Cypr. ibid.*

der's Seat, how comes it that *Cyprian*, says *Celerinus*, should read the Scriptures *Plebi universæ* to the whole People? Not to the whole People of one Congregation I hope; for then when *Cyprian* directs his Epistles *Plebi universæ*, to all the People, it must be said, he directs his Epistles only to one Congregation of his People, which is ridiculous.

Then he who was a Reader, was Reader to all the People of which *Cyprian* was Bishop; and seeing a Person could not be Reader to more Congregations than one, it is evident, *Cyprian* was a Bishop but of one Congregation. What I'm saying is evident from what *Cyprian* writeth in Epist: 38. directed to the Presbyters and all the People of his Diocess, with respect to *Aurelius* another Reader he had ordain'd. You have his words in the margin (w) by which you will see *Aurelius* was Reader to all the People, of whom *Cyprian* was *Sacerdos* or Bishop.

In like manner, when *Numidicus* was ordain'd Presbyter, *Cyprian* sends no word what Congregation he was ordain'd to, or was to serve in. He tells them indeed, That the desolation of the Presbytery would be in some measure helped by the addition of this Person to their Number; but as to the helping of the desolation of a vacant Paroch, not one word. From all which it is evident, that the Episcopal Church or Diocess of *Carthage* (the greatest then in the World, except *Rome*, or, may be, *Alexandria*) was but one single Congregation in *Cyprian's* time; and consequently that all the Episcopal Churches in the World then, were no other than Congregational Churches.

Perhaps *J. S.'s* Friends may think he has done no small service to modern Prelacy by his *Principles of the Cyprianick Age, and Vindication, &c.* But he has

(*) Vos orationibus frequenter insistite, & preces nostras vestris precibus adjuvate, ut Domini misericordia favens nobis, cito *Plebi sue* & *sacerdotem* reddat incolumem & Martyrem cum sacerdote *Leituram*.

has not yet proved (and never will) that the Bishops in the 2d or 3d Centurie had every one of them many particular Churches under their Charge; yet till he proves this evidently and clearly, his pretended Bishops can reap no more advantage by these his Learn'd Volumes, than the *Indian Brabmans* or *Persian Magi*. Nay, if it be true, as it is certainly, that the Bishops in those Ages were but Pastours of one Congregation, it will be found, that *J. S.* has been fighting all this time for his Adversaries, writing in favours of the *Presbyterian* or Congregational Bishops, and advancing their Ministerial Power as far as he could; and if there be any solidity in his Reasonings, and they have any liking to such Power, I think they are obliged to him for his Industry, and owe him thanks, tho his intention was to serve another Set of Men: And I think he owes me thanks likewise for making him a Bishop sooner than he expected; but if the Revenue of a Bishoprick be the thing he is for, I can do him no service at all as to that.

It will be told us here (with great fierceness no doubt) that the *Presbyterian* Ministers can never pretend to be such Bishops as they were, who lived in the 2d or 3d Centurie, because their Presbyters (or Ruling-Elders) do not preach and baptize. But that is nothing. *Cyprian* had once 8 Presbyters in his Diocess, 5 of them apostatized and separated unjustly from him, and he continued all his days Bishop of *Carthage* with his 3 Presbyters and Deacons, for ought we know. If the 3 Presbyters had deserted him also, will any Person think, that good *Cyprian* would therefore have ceased to be a Bishop or Bishop of *Carthage*? One then may be really a Bishop, tho he has no Presbyters at all: And much more, say I, are our *Presbyterian* Ministers really Bishops, seeing they have Presbyters under them, tho these Presbyters do not preach and baptize; and

seeing

seeing they have an Episcopal Charge, exert the Episcopal Office, and faithfully and diligently do all the things, which by the Laws of *Jesus Christ* are incumbent upon Bishops. And is the King of *Britain* no King, because forsooth he has no Mareschals of *Britain*, as he over Sea has Mareschals of *France*?

Then if it be said, that our Ministers are not Bishops, because they want one kind of Church-Officers (if it can be said they want them, because tho' they have them, they allow them not to preach, &c.) which the *Cyprianick* Bishops had, much more were not the *Scottish* Prelats Bishops, because they wanted two sorts of Officers the *Cyprianick* Bishops had, viz. Sub-deacons and *Acolythi*.

Again, if our Ministers are not Bishops, because they want a kind of Officers the *Cyprianick* Bishops had; *a pari*, the *English* Prelats are not Bishops, because they have a kind of Officers the *Cyprianick* Bishops never had nor heard of, to wit, Chancellours, Sub-chancellours, &c. It will be easy to say, this will not follow, but it will not be easy to produce Reasons why it will not follow.

If it be further alledged, Our Ministers are not Bishops, because they want Episcopal Ordination, this is *petitio principii*; say I, They have Episcopal Ordination, (the Persons who ordain'd them were such Bishops as *Cyprian*, *Firmilian*, *Paulinus*, &c.) and therefore they are Bishops. Moreover, Ordination strictly taken, is a Ceremonie, the having of which does not make, or the want of it hinder Persons to be Bishops, as Coronation does not make a Man King of *Britain*.

If they will yet tell us, That our Ministers cannot prove their Ordination in an uninterrupted line of Succession from the Apostles; We answer, Neither can the *English* Prelates, nor their Grandfather the Pope. It will be no difficult thing to prove the Ordination of the Presbyterian Bishops in *Scotland*

or elsewhere, in an uninterrupted line of Succession from the Apostles, with as great evidence as that of the *English* Prelates can be proven. The Presbyterian Bishops in *Scotland* at the Reformation derived their Ordination from Bishops, who were Pastours of many Congregations; and that was a pollution of their Ordination, which they did put off with other Popish Errors. And the Ordination of the present Presbyterian Bishops is derived from Congregational Bishops; in like manner, if the Ordination of the *English* Prelates be traced up to the 4th, 3d, and 2d Centuries, it will be found to be derived from Congregational Bishops the same way.

However this pretended Conveyance of Ecclesiastical Power by lineal Succession from the Apostles is but a contemptible Popish Fiction, invented to support a desperate Cause; and one should speak as good sense, who should say, That the Magistratical Power of the Major of *London* is conveyed to him from his Predecessors independently of the Corporation which elects him; or that the right which a Shoe-maker has to make Shoes, is conveyed to him by an uninterrupted line of Succession from Shoe-maker to Shoe-maker, till ye ascend to him, who was first Shoe-maker in the World: (x)

Then they say, That our Presbyters are but Laicks, *Lay-Elders*. But why so, pray? Because they do not preach and administer Sacraments. May they not as well say, the Chancellour or Major are not Magistrates, because they cannot call or dissolve Parliaments, or do these things which belong to a superiour Officer? Our Elders are Church-Officers in as proper a sense as the best Bishop or Arch-Dean among them. And to tell us of Lay-Officers, is to speak

(x) They who desire full satisfaction as to this particular, may consult the illustrious Mr. *Claude's* Defence of the Reformation, and the Defence of Mr. *H's* brief Enquiry into the Nature of Schism; a Book for which we are much obliged to the ingenious and excellent Author Mr. *Tong*. They who understand these two Books, will soon perceive the vanity of all that the Papists or Prelatists have said on this Head.

Speak Contradictions; if one be a Church-Officer, he is no Laick.

Now after all, tho we could not prove, that the Bishops in the first two Centuries had each of them but one Congregation for their Diocess, we are secure abundantly, if Persons may be proper lawful Diocesan Bishops, tho their Pastoral Jurisdiction be confin'd within the limits of one small Congregation, or have but one Paroch for their Diocess. I ask this Question then at our Episcopal Friends, *VVhy may not a Person be a Diocesan Bishop, who is but a Pastour of one Congregation?* I'm afraid, they will find it right difficult to give a satisfactory Answer to this Question. There is no possibility of perswading some People, that such Pastours are or can be reckon'd Diocesan Bishops; and if they could produce any Text of Scripture, declaring either expressly or by just Consequence, that one who is a Pastour but of one Congregation, is no Bishop; or so much as one Father affirming it, or any thing like it; or any Canon of any Council universal or particular, National or Provincial, determining that such Pastours are not, or these who were such Pastours, shall not be reputed Bishops in time to come; or if they can make it appear by any Argument or Reason whatsoever, or any thing that looks like common Sense, That it is inconsistent with the nature of the Episcopal Office, that it be confin'd to one Congregation; they might be excused: But seeing nothing of this can be pretended, and seeing they can give no reason at all, why they should think that such Pastours are not Diocesan Bishops, I confess I cannot but wonder at their obstinacy and weakness, as a miraculous kind of thing.

The late Bishop of *Worcester* says, *Suppose that the first Churches were barely Congregational, by reason of the small number of Believers at that time, yet what Obligation lyes upon us to reduce Churches to their*

infant state? (y) And say we, What Obligation lies on a Diocesan Bishop to grasp at the Charge of more Congregations than one? of more People than he can take personal inspection of, or dare be accountable to God for? Where did the Apostles ever say to the Bishops, Tho' each of you has but one Congregation for your Diocess, now when the number of Christians is small, yet ye shall take care when Believers are increased, every one of you, to extend your Episcopal Jurisdiction over a multitude of Congregations, that so ye may have great Rents, and be in a condition to live splendidly, as Princes in this World? What Father did ever affirm, It is essential to a Bishop that he have the Charge of many Congregations, or delivered it as his Opinion, that a Person is no Bishop, if he be but a Bishop of one Paroch? What Council either general or particular, ever determined any such thing?

No Man ever doubted, that *Gregory Thaumaturgus* was a Diocesan Bishop, even when he had but seventeen Persons in his whole Diocess; (z) or *Gregory Nazianzen*, who, when he was made Bishop of *Constantinople* in the 5th Centurie, the most considerable City in the World next to *Rome*, a Metropolitcal See and Patriarchal Seat soon after, had but one small Flock or little Congregation belonging to his Diocess, as appears from his own words. *Ibey*, saith

(y) It was certainly a blunder to say, that the Churches were in their infant itate when they were left by the Apostles. On the contrary they were then in the most perfect state, and the more the succeeding Churches departed from their Constitution, the more corrupt were they. Who are such fools as to believe, that the Bishops of *Rome* or *England* could or would bring the Church to a more perfect state than could the Apostles, who were guided by an infallible Spirit? unless you will think that is the most perfect state of the Church, which makes most for the temporal advantage of her Rulers.

(z) *Basilius Magnus* in an Epistle to the Presbyters of *Nicopolis* or the Diocess there, says, *Is it a trouble to you, that the Arian Bishop has the house of Prayer in possession, and you are necessitated to worship the God of Heaven and Earth in the open field? Consider that the 12 Apostles were shut up in a garret, when the Crucifiers of Christ were going about their Devotion in the publick Temple.* Would he of *Nicopolis* have been no Bishop, because there was but one House of Prayer or Church in the Diocess, in which he and all the Presbyters together might go about Divine Worship? *Epist.* 192.

saith he, (to wit the *Arians*) have the Temples, but we have the God that dwells in them; and we our selves are the Temples; they have the People for them, we have the Angels for us; they have for their Portion Assurance and Rashness, we have the Faith on our side; they have Threatnings, we have Prayers; they persecute, and we suffer; they have Gold and Silver, and we are in possession of the Holy Doctrine: but O UR FLOCK IS LITTLE, yes, but it does not go to throw it self over Precipices: Our Sheep-fold is narrow, but it is well guarded against Wolves; it does not ly open to Robbers, and Strangers cannot enter into it. This little Flock, which will every day grow greater by the grace of God, gives me no cause to fear: I SEE IT, I COUNT IT EASILY, I KNOW MY SHEEP, AND THEY KNOW ME, THEY HEAR MY VOICE, THEY ANSWER ME, I CALL THEM, AND THEY FOLLOW ME, they will not follow Strangers, they will not follow Valentinus, Montanus, Manes, &c. (a) Had not Gregory but one Congregation in his Diocess then? and was he not a lawful Diocesan Bishop, a Diocesan Bishop in the most proper sense for all that? With what face then (b) can it be denied, That Presbyterian Ministers are Diocesan Bishops in a proper sense, seeing all the world is perswaded, and even our Prelatits themselves, that these Persons we have named, were really Bishops, when Pastours

(a) Οὐ φοβῆμαι τὸ μικρὸν ποίμνιον ἐν σὺν ἑστίῳ γὰρ, ὅτι γινώσκω τὰ ἐμὰ καὶ γινώσκομαι ὑπὸ τῶν ἐμῶν, τὰ πρόβατα τὰ ἐμὰ τῆς φωνῆς μου ἀκούει, ταῦτα καλῶ καὶ ὄνομα, καὶ ἀκολουθεῖσί μοι, ἐκρίθην γὰρ ἐπὶ ὕδατος ἀναπαύσεως. Orat. 25.

(b) By the law of God, and according to the ancient Practice, Princes may model the bounds of Episcopal Jurisdiction, erect Bishopricks, enlarge, diminish, or transfer them as they please, says the learn'd Doctor *Burrow Pop: Supr. p. 255.* And if Princes may diminish Bishopricks as they please, they may if they please diminish them to one Congregation. And what will become then of all the fearful Clamours against the Parliament of *Scotland*, for abolishing Episcopacy, seeing they have but diminished Bishopricks to one Congregation, or made every Congregation a Bishoprick, which this Learn'd Episcopal Doctor says they might lawfully do?

Pastours but of one Congregation? But I'm afraid we have insisted too long on this first thing Mr. C. reckons essential to a Bishop. We come now to the second.

C H A P. IV.

The falsity of the second Proposition Mr. Chillingworth should have demonstrated, discovered by making it appear, that the ancient Bishop acted in Affairs of Government, in conjunction with all the Presbyters of the Diocess, and not a convenient Number of Assistants only.

THE second Proposition Mr. Chillingworth should have demonstrated to us, is, *That the Bishops in the second Centurie acted in Affairs of Government, in conjunction not with all the Presbyters in their Diocess, but a convenient Number of Assistants only, or with a small Number of the Presbyters, the rest being altogether excluded.*

This Point will suffer a quicker and more easy dispatch than the former; in a word, Mr. C. could not have advanced a greater Untruth. That the Affairs of the Church in the 2d or 3d Centurie were managed by the Bishop and all his Presbyters without exception, is a thing so well known, that it is not worth the while to spend time in proving it.

Who will deny that the Bishop in the second Centurie acted in conjunction with the Presbytery? or affirm, there were many other Presbyters in the Diocess,

cess, than they who were call'd the Presbytery, or made up that Court? *Ignat. ad Magn: Subject to the Bishop as the Grace of God, and to the Presbytery as to the Law of Jesus Christ. Wherefore it will become you also not to take advantage of the youth of your Bishop, but to yield all reverence to him, as also I perceive that our holy Presbyters do.* Does not Subjection to the Bishop and Presbytery imply, that the Bishop and Presbytery acted in conjunction? and did not all the Presbyters in the Diocess reverence the Bishop, and not a few of them only? And seeing these, who are called *Presbyters* in the end of this Sentence, are the same with the *Presbyterie* in the beginning of it; must we not say, that the Presbytery comprehends all the Presbyters of the Diocess? And what is there to be met with in any of the Writings of the first 3 or 4 Centuries, that may give even the least ground to suspect there were other Presbyters in the Diocess besides the Presbytery? The Deacons did sit in the Presbytery, and will any body suppose, that the main bulk of the Presbyters were excluded, or that a competent Number of them only were admitted? What was the convenient Number that acted in conjunction with *Cyprian*, when there were but three Presbyters in all his Diocess? or that moderated the Authority of *Gregory Thaumaturgus*, when there were but 17 Persons in his whole Diocess? And does not the Council of *Sardica* (an. 374) *Can. 1.* appoint, That a Bishop shall not be ordain'd in a little City (contrary to *Paul's* express Orders *Tit. 1. v. 5.*) where one Presbyter is sufficient, lest the Dignity of a Bishop be lessened? And does not this imply, that before that time a Bishop us'd to be ordain'd to a Diocess; for which one Presbyter was sufficient, or a Diocess which was but one Congregation? And does not even this Canon permit a Bishop to be ordain'd, where two Presbyters, or a Bishop and one Presbyter are sufficient for the whole

Work?

Work? So that it is not to be doubted there were abundance of Diocesses in the 4th Centurie, in which there was but a Bishop and one Presbyter. (c) And it is likely, that from this time they did begin to have Diocesses in *Asia* consisting of more Congregations than one. But it is needless to insist any further on this particular.

C H A P. V.

The falsity of the third Proposition Mr. Chillingworth should have proven, manifested.

THE third thing which Mr. Ch. should have demonstrated to us, is, *That the Bishop in the second Centurie could, as he thought fit, rule with, or against the Advice of these few of his Presbyters, who were admitted to sit and act in conjunction with him.*

There is as little truth in this Position, as in any of the other two, and is denied by, I believe, the greater part, and I'm sure the most eminent of the Prelatical Writers themselves, who pretend to no more

(c) Numidius observes upon the Proposal of *Aurelius* of Carthage, That it was always lawful for the Bishop of Carthage to take those whom he desired and ordain them, tho' they were of another Diocess. *Epigonius* declares in the Name of the Bishops, that it is his Right. But *Posthumius* remonstrates, that it may happen, *That a Bishop shall have but one Presbyter*, and it is not just to take him away from him. *Aurelius* answers, A Bishop may easily ordain many Presbyters, but that it is more difficult to find fit Persons to be Bishops: and therefore tho a Bishop should have but one Presbyter, he ought to give him that he may be made a Bishop. *Posthumius* replies, That therefore it is just that another Church, that has many Clergy-men, should furnish him who has given his one Presbyter. And it is replied, That he who has many, shall give some to him who has parted with his one Presbyter to be a Bishop.

more, but that the Bishop had a Negative Voice in the Presbytery. Is it not a wonder then, how Mr. C. could advance such things without the least shadow of Probation, and then call what he says upon the Head, *Demonstration*? It is needless to insist on proving, that the Bishop had not such Power; the vanity of this Pretence will appear clearly enough, when we come to examine the Arguments, by which some think they can prove the Bishop had such Power in *Cyprian's* time. We produce only a Canon of a Council, which will prove as clearly, that the Bishop had no such Power in those days, as an express Act of Parliament can prove, that the President has no absolute Power or Negative Voice in the Session. This Canon is the 23d of a Council at *Carthage An. 398.* the words whereof are these: *Let the Bishop hear no Cause but in the presence of his Clergy,* not a part of his Clergy, *and the Sentences he shall give in the absence of his Clergy, shall be null and void.*

To tell us, that this Canon speaks of *the presence* of the Clergy, but not of their *Consent*, is frivolous, for presence here signifies consent. Thus Council *Carth: An. 390.* Canon 10. *A Bishop accused shall defend his Cause in the presence of 12 Bishops at least.* Might the Presbytery sentence the accus'd Bishop, whether the 12 Bishops consented or not, because it is said, He shall defend his Cause *in the presence* of 12 Bishops?

And thus *Cyprian* Epist: 67. speaking of the Election of a Bishop, says, *Et Episcopus deligatur Plebe presente,* and what is his meaning, think you, when he says, the Bishop should be chosen in the presence of the People? No other than this, That the Bishop should be chosen by the *Suffrages* of the People, or their *Elective Voice*; this is evident, for *deligatur Plebe presente*, chosen in the presence of the People, is explain'd immediately after by *Cyprian*

himself, thus, *Ut de universæ Fraternitatis suffragio Episcopatus ei deferretur.* i.e. So that the Episcopacy was conferr'd on him by the Elective Voices of the whole Brotherhood. And truly one positive Canon of a Council has more weight, than a thousand Arguments and obscure Consequences from ambiguous Phrases or Modes of Expression.

From what has been said, it is easy to see what a vast difference there is betwixt the present *English* Prelates and these who were call'd Bishops in the 2d or 3d Centurie (d). The Bishop in the second Centurie was a Pastour of one Congregation: The *English* Prelate is a Pastour of many hundred Congregations, tho' to speak properly he is no Pastour at all. The Bishop in the second Centurie acted in Affairs of Government, in conjunction with all the Presbyters in the whole Diocess: but the fiftieth part of the Presbyters of the Diocess is not admitted to act in conjunction with the *English* Prelate. The *English* Prelate has absolute Power: but the Bishop in the 2d or 3d Centurie had not a Negative Voice, as will afterward appear. Moreover, the Bishop in the 2d or 3d Centurie was chosen by the Church: and the *English* Prelate is elected by the State (e). Wherefore if those in the 2d or 3d Centurie were properly Bishops, the *English* Prelates are not Bishops at all. And to speak the truth plainly,
to

(d) And here we have reason to abhor the Impiety of these, who pretend there is as much, if not greater, Evidence, that Episcopacy was the Government of the Church ever since the days of the Apostles, than there is for the Canon of the Scripture. If by Episcopacy they understand such as goes under that Name now, it is evident from what we have said, That to affirm the Government was Episcopal ever since the Apostles, is to affirm a most notorious Untruth. If by Episcopacy be understood Primitive Episcopacy, they speak not to the purpose, and say upon the Matter, that Presbytery was the Government of the Church ever since the Apostles, and would deceive People by the ambiguous Signification of the word *Episcopacy*. If by Bishops they understand such as are now in *England*, they speak deceitfully and against their own Conscience, unless they be convinced, the Canon of Scripture is but a Cheat. If by Bishops they understand something else, they speak like Idiots, and affirm that, which makes just nothing for the Cause they defend.

(e) *Ubi ille Canon, ut a Palatio mittatur is qui futurus est Episcopus?* i. e. Where is that Canon to be found, that appoints Bishops to be elected by the King? *Atban. Ep. ad Solit. Vit. agent.*

to call these Prelates Bishops is to confound things, and to abuse the People, by making them imagine they are under the same kind of Ecclesiastical Government, the Ancient and Primitive Church was.

If the *Romans* had taken it in their head to retain the Name, and call their Emperours Consuls; we might have affirmed with as much Reason or Probability, that there was no difference betwixt the Roman Government in *Trajan's* time, and before the last *Punick* War, as our Prelatists can that there is no difference betwixt the Government of the *English* Church, and that in the 2d or 3d Centurie. It would be an easy thing to bring as strong Arguments out of *T. Livius* and other Authors, to prove, that the Power of a Consul was as great as that of an Emperour, as Mr. *Dodwel* or *J. S.* bring out of *Cyprian's* Epistles, to prove, that the Power of the Bishop in the 3d Centurie was as absolute as the Power of an *English* Bishop.

Thus *Livius* says somewhere, *That the Power of a Roman Consul was infinite.* Hence such as *J. S.* might conclude very confidently, That the Power of the Consuls was more absolute than that of the Emperours afterward, seeing any Person will readily grant, that the Power of the Emperours was never infinite. *Virgil* says with respect to *Brutus*, *Consulis Imperium primus accipiet.* The Power of the Consul then was as great as the Emperour's, for what had the Emperour more than *Dominion* or *Empire*? And, *quem penes Urbanarum sunt fastigia rerum*, is what might have been said of any Consul. And an Argument might be brought from this Phrase, as weighty as any proposed by *J. S.* from any Phrase out of *Cyprian*. It is frequently said in *Roman* Histories, *That such a Consul made such a Law*; and hence it may be proven, *That the Consul could by himself, and by his own singular Authority, give Laws to the whole Common-wealth, to the Senate as well as*

others, as *J. S.* says with respect to the Bishop in the *Cyprianick* Age. *I conclude*, says he, that the Bishop could by himself, and by vertue of his own singular Authority, give Laws to the whole Diocess, to the Presbyters as well as others.

After this it might be proven, that the *Roman* Magistrates were never elected by the People, with as much evidence as *J. S.* proves, that the Bishops in *Cyprian's* time were not elected by the People. Some Writers of the *Roman* Historie say, That their Magistrates were elected *Δήμαρχων χειροτονία*, i. e. by Suffrages of the Tribunes. And tho' the *Roman* Authors tell us expressly, that the Magistrates were chosen *Suffragio Populi*, by the People's Elective Voice, that is nothing. It is easy to say with *J. S.* (p. 392) It must be obvious to any Man of common-sense, that the *Plebs*, the common People, were every way unfitted and unqualified to choose Consuls, Generals, *Pontifices Maximos*, &c. then, that *Suffragium* sometimes signifies quite another thing than *Elective Voice*; and so, when we find it said in any Author, that the Magistrates were chosen *Suffragio Populi*, we have no more to do but to say with *J. S.* seeing *Suffragium* is oft times taken in another sense, it is not necessary that it signify *Elective Voice* in this place: the Sentence will go every whit as smoothly and naturally, and much more appositely, if we understand no more by it than *approbation* or *good liking*, &c. And if we had as obscure a Description of the state of the *Roman* Empire in the *Roman* Historians, as we have of the state of the *Ancient Church* in *Ecclesiastical* Authors; and if there were Interest at the bottom, to set Men's Invention a work, no doubt there would be abundance of Persons among us to deny with the greatest confidence imaginable, that ever there was any such thing as *Democratical Government*, either at *Rome* or *Athens*; and they would have as pro-

probable Arguments to prove their Point, as the Prelatists have to prove, that their Government is the same with that of the Ancient Church.

C H A P. VI.

The Superstructure, which Mr. Chillingworth builds upon the foresaid false Foundation, overturned.

HAVING thus destroyed the Foundation of Mr. C.'s Demonstration, and proven, that the Ancient Bishop had none of these three things he reckons Essential to Episcopacy; let us now consider his Inferences.

Seeing, saith he, that *Episcopal Government is confessedly so Ancient*. What Episcopal Government so Ancient? Such as is now in *England*, or such as he describes? Pray, who confesses any such thing? There was no Episcopacy (in the modern sense) in the Church, till the Pastours became Bishops of more Congregations than one; and seeing all the Diocesses during the first three Centuries were but Congregational Churches, there were no Bishops in the modern sense in the World then; and excepting *Rome* and *Alexandria*, there were not many in the 4th Centurie: wherefore we may say, That that which is now call'd Episcopacy, was carried on by degrees in the 5th and 6th Centuries, † according as

† The 7th Canon Counc: of *Tarracon*, held Anno 516, is expressed thus: *In Country Parochies a Presbyter and a Deacon shall stay there by turns, each in their week*. Hence it is evident, Presbyters were not as yet fixed as Pastours in the Country Paroches, that all the Presbyters of the Diocess did reside in the Town where the Bishop's Church was, and were sent from thence by

as Christians increased and Diocesses were enlarged, and it may be doubted, that Episcopacy was universal even in the 6th Centurie; and if a Negative Voice be reckon'd Essential to a Bishop, as it is to a King (for if the Supreme Magistrate has no Negative in the Parliament, he can scarce be accounted a King) I can't say, that ever I saw it clearly proven there were Bishops in the Church even in the 7th Centurie. However there was no Episcopal Government in the Church in all respects, like that now in *England*, no not for a thousand years after *Christ*.

So great a Change could not possibly have prevail'd all the VWorld over in a little time. But there was no such Change as he pretends for many hundred years. According to the ordinary Reckoning among Divines, there was some Change made in the Govern-

ment

turns to officiate in the Country-Paroches of the Diocess. And the 2d Canon Counc: *Vasio* in the year 529, is thus: *We thought fit for the Edification of all the Churches, and Advantage of the whole People, to give Power to the Presbyters to Preach, not only in Cities, but in all the Country-Paroches: and if a Presbyter through Indisposition cannot preach at a time, a Deacon may read the Homilies of the Fathers.* This Canon would have been ridiculous, if the Episcopal Diocesses in the 6th Centurie had been in the state they are in now, and gives us to understand they were but beginning then to set up the Presbyters as Preachers in the Country-Paroches. And even in the 7th Centurie there were not Paroches enough in the Episcopal Diocess for all the Presbyters, as is evident from the 27th and 23d Canons of the 4th Counc: of *Toledo* in that Centurie. The 27th Canon imports, *That the Presbyters and Deacons put into Paroches, are to promise to their Bishop, that they will live regularly and orderly.* And the 23d Canon has respect to the *Presbyters and Deacons that do not live in the House with the Bishop.* Wherefore in the 7th Centurie some of the Presbyters were fix'd in Paroches, and lived in them; others of them lived with the Bishop, and had no Paroches at all after the Ancient way. And for ought we know, the greater part of the Presbyters then were without Paroches. And the Learn'd and Judicious Gentleman Sir *Jas: Dalrymple* makes it appear, That *Fothad*, who was the first Bishop in the modern sense that was settled in *Scotland*, lived in the year 960. So that what is now called Episcopacy, was but beginning to take footing there in the 10th Centurie. And after he has told us, That the 2d Bishoprick that was erected in *Scotland*, was at *Murthlac* (the Seat of which *Aberdeen* was made some time after) in the sixth year of the Reign of *K. Malcolm* the 2d *An. Dom. 1010*, He says, *Here we may observe, that the King in his Charter freely of himself disposes of Churches, which he would not have done without their Consent, if they had depended upon any Bishop; that there were Churches before the Erection of Bishopricks, and that the Extent and Jurisdiction of the Bishopricks in Scotland were very small at the beginning, which is clear, seeing till this Bishoprick got the Jurisdiction of the Shires of Aberdeen and Bannock added by St. David, it was very mean and inconsiderable.* Collections concerning the *Scottish History*, &c. pag. 136. A very curious Book, and well worth the Reading.

ment of the Church in the second Centurie; but this Change was so small and inconsiderable, that it might be made without any difficulty or noise in a very short time. True, if a great Change had been carried on at first, or if they had attempted in the second Centurie to set up Episcopacy in such a hight as it is in at this day, all the Churches might have startled at such an alteration, nay had certainly made opposition, and the Business had miscarried. But (as says a Famous and Eminent Divine) the Devil took such cunning measures in carrying on his Project, that it was impossible it could miscarry; the first degrees of Tyrannie and Superstition were such an inconsiderable thing, that tho' it was a Novelty, it neither was nor could be perceived. For example, what danger could they conceive (to wit, the Ancient Christians) in paying a respect to the Memory of the Martyrs, and making honourable mention of them, when they celebrated the Mysteries; how could the Churches be upon their guard, when nothing was as yet aim'd at, but some Honours of Precedency betwixt a Presbyter and a Bishop, and the Bishop of one Town and the Bishop of another? I'm perswaded, that the Mysterie of Iniquity was carried on by ways, where the Apostles themselves were not sensible of the Evil, or aware of the Danger. For instance it was Customary in the times of the Apostles, to assemble now and then in the Cimiteries, and on the Graves of the Martyrs, I believe *Paul* had this Custom in view. *1 Cor. 15. And if the dead rise not, why are they then baptiz'd on the dead?* i. e. To what purpose pay you this Honour to the Martyrs, in celebrating the Mysteries upon their Graves, if they are no more, and will never rise again? This seem'd to be the most innocent thing in the World, to pray to God in a Cimiterie, and upon the Graves of the

'dead,

Jurieu Accompl: de Proph: Tom. 1. p. 301.

' dead, in testimony they would die in the Faith, in
 ' which the Martyrs died; yet this was the first
 ' source of Popish Idolatry. From the first degree
 ' to the second, there is but one step, and from the
 ' second to the third the Passage is insensible, and
 ' thus People are plung'd in Superstition and Tyranny
 ' before they are aware or can be sensible of it.
 ' When Corruptions are imperceptible in their Progress,
 ' the People cannot discern them. And thus
 ' the Devil carried on that Myserie of Iniquity,
 ' which was set on work even in *Paul's* time. *Satan*
 ' did also pave the way to Tyranny (that is Prelacy)
 ' by these Disputes about Precedency and Honours,
 ' of which we have a kind of Specimen in the Contests
 ' at *Corinth*, some saying, I'm of *Paul*, others,
 ' I'm of *Apollo*, &c. But who could have dream'd
 ' things would have gone such a length, as afterwards
 ' they did?

Thus any alteration that was made in the Government
 of the Church in the second Centurie, was small and inconsiderable;
 and the greater alterations which were made at length, were
 carried on insensibly and by imperceptible degrees: So that
 this Change was not great some hundreds of Years after
 the Apostles. But Mr. C. pretends deceitfully, the
 Presbyterians believe the form of the Government was
 totally chang'd, and that bare-facedly at the very first;
 so that Episcopacy was set up in its full height quickly
 after the time of the Apostles, even in the second Centurie,
 and then founds his Arguments upon the impossibility of
 such a great alteration in such a short time. Which is a way
 of Arguing fit only for deceiving Children, or such as are
 content to be deceived.

Had the Churches err'd, continues Mr. C. *they would have varied, what therefore is one and the same amongst all, came not by Error but Tradition.* This Maxim of *Tertullian's* is not universally true, and is sufficient-

refuted by Experience. To administer the Sacrament of the Eucharist to Infants, was an error; yet this Practice prevail'd in all the Churches, and even in the second Centurie (d). *Augustin* says with respect thereto, *Ex antiqua ut existimo & Apostolica traditione, &c.* The Churches of *Christ* hold by an Ancient, and, I think, Apostolical Tradition, &c. And *Maldonat*, no Presbyterian, I assure you, says, This was the universal Practice of the Church from the departure of the Apostles, for the space of 600 Years.

Then he adds, *What universal Cause can be feign'd of this universal Apostacy? You will not imagine, that the Apostles, &c. General Councils to make a Law for a general Change, there were none, &c.* That in the second Centurie there was some small Change made in the Government, is, as was said, generally yielded; but that the Alteration in that Centurie was considerable, or such as might be call'd an Apostacy, is Mr. C's fiction; and I think he needed not take his Invention to find out Causes of a Chimera, which never had any Existence but in his own Imagination. And pray, what General Councils were there, to appoint Water to be mix'd with the Eucharistical Wine, which (as appears from *Justin's* first Apologie) was a Practice in the second Centurie? or to appoint the Eucharist to be administered to Infants? What follows is but wind. How easy is it to answer our Prelatical Friends in Mr. C's own words, thus?

What Device then shall we study, or to what Fountain shall we reduce this strange pretended Alteration? (suppose in the Practice of the Church, with respect to the Eucharist, their mingling Water

I with

(d) Hence you may see the frivolousness of these Considerations propos'd by J. S. in the 1 C. of his Vindic. Sect. 30 to 31, to persuade us, that it was impossible that any Alteration at all could happen in the Government of the Church, between the Apostle *John's* death and *Cyprian's* time. Why might not an Alteration be made in the Government during that time, as well as in the Eucharist, a Point of daily Practice?

with the Wine, or their administering this Sacrament to Infants) Can it enter into our hearts to think, that all the Bishops, and other Christians then, being the Apostles Scholars, could be generally ignorant of the Will of *Christ* touching the Elements of the Eucharist, or the Persons to whom this Sacrament should be administered? Or dare we adventure to think them so strangely wicked all the World over, as to conspire against Knowledge and Conscience, to profane this Sacrament, by making an addition to the Elements, or by administering it to those, who they knew were not capable of it, and to whom they knew it was never administered in the Apostolical times? I imagine, that some or many of the Bishops had introduced this Practice, was it possible they should achieve it at once, without any opposition or contradiction? And besides that this Contagion should spread it self, and prevail, without stop and controul, nay without any noise or notice taken of it through all the Churches in the World, all the Watchmen in the mean time being so fast a sleep, and all the Dogs so dumb, that not so much as one should open its mouth against this Innovation, &c. And therefore to mingle Water with the Wine in the Eucharist, being a Practice so Ancient and Catholick, must be granted also to be Apostolical. *Quod erat demonstrandum.*

C H A P. VII.

The Arguments of the Prelatists for their Bishops are as weak as the Arguments of the Papists for Transubstantiation.

AFTER all, I can't but say, our Episcopal Friends here are put to miserable shifts, and their Cause is at a low pass, when they make a Parade with such a contemptible Sophism as this pretended Demonstration; a Sophism, that will serve to prove any Error whatsoever, which came insensibly, and without opposition, into the Church, as well every whit as the Divine Institution of Modern Prelacy, and made use of every way to as good purpose by Mr. *Arnaud*, a French Papist, to prove *Transubstantiation* it self, as any Person may see, who will be at the pains to read his Book, intitied, *Perpetuite de la Foy de l'Eglise touchent l'Eucharistie*. Certainly it is a pity that the Person, who caused Arch-Bishop *Usher's* Original of Bishops and Metropolitans, together with this Demonstration of Mr. *Chillingworth*, to be lately re-printed at *Edinburgh*, did not see Mr. *Arnaud's* Book; if he had, he might have set out the noble Demonstration with considerable Amendments, and strengthned the Argument with some pretty little Re-inforcements, as you may see by comparing the second Column here subjoin'd with the first, in which you have Mr. *Arnaud's* words translated out of the foresaid Book, pag: 19, &c. Edit: *Paris: Anno 1666.*

IF the Ancient Church was Calvinistical, and believed Christ was really absent from the Symbols, it could not come to that State it was in in *Berengarius's* time, without an universal Change of Belief; and it cannot be imagin'd, that this Change could happen but one of these two ways, which are both equally impossible. (1st.) That this Change was made in an instant, so that when all Christians believed till such a time, that Christ was not Corporally present in the Eucharist, they began all of them together to believe, he was Corporally present, and going to bed Calvinists, arose in the morning Papists, without knowing how, and forgetting quite what they formerly were. But this is so absurd, that I stand not to refute it. Or (2^{dly}.) That this Change was made insensibly, that some introduced the Opinion of Transubstantiation; that these some had but few Followers

at

IF the Ancient Church was Presbyterian, and believed, that Pastours acting in parity was a Divine Institution, it could not come to that State it was in in *Aerius's* time, without an universal Change in Belief and Practice; and it can't be imagin'd, this Change could happen but one of these two ways, which are both equally impossible. (1) That this Change was made in an instant: So that when all Christians believed till such a time, the Church should be ruled by Pastours acting in parity, they began all of them together to believe, the Church should be rul'd by a Bishop, and going to bed Presbyterians, arose Episcopal in the morning, not knowing how, and forgetting quite what they formerly were. But this is so absurd, that I stand not to refute it. Or (2^{dly}.) That this Change was made insensibly, that some introduced the Opinion of Episcopacy; that these some

had

at first, but at length had but few Followers at this Opinion spread it first; but at length this self insensibly every Opinion was spread insensibly every where.

According to this Supposition, there behoved to be a time, to wit, when this Opinion first arose, in which it was followed by a small number of Persons only; another time in which this number was greatly increased, and equal'd that of those who did not believe the real Presence of Christ in the Eucharist; another in which this Opinion was Master of the Multitude, tho' it was oppos'd still by many others, who continued in the Ancient Faith; & in fine another time, in which it reign'd peaceably and without opposition: Which is the state in which the Calvinists must confess it was when *Berengarius* did begin to excite Disputes about this Matter.

‘ If the Opinion of the Papists was an Innovation, ’tis impossible it could come in insensibly, without passing through these degrees. Yet every one

According to this Supposition there behoved to be a time, to wit, when this Opinion first arose, in which it was followed by a small number of Persons only; another time in which this number was greatly increased, and equal'd that of those who were against Episcopacy; another in which this Opinion was Master of the Multitude, tho' oppos'd still by many others, who were for Presbytery; and in fine another time, in which it reign'd peaceably and without opposition: Which is the state in which most Presbyterians will acknowledge it was when *Aerius* appear'd in the World.

If the Opinion of the Prelatists was an Innovation, ’tis impossible it could come in insensibly, without passing through these degrees. Yet every one

‘ one of these degrees contains insupportable absurdities.

‘ To begin with the first: If the Doctrine of Transubstantiation was introduced by one or a few Persons, how is it possible their name could remain unknown; or that they could publish such a surprising Novelty, without any Person's being astonish'd at it, or setting himself to oppose it? Is it possible the Priests, the Curates or Bishops did not all perceive this rising Idolatry, or perceiving it, made not the least effort to suppress it, or to turn the People from this Error? How is it possible, that, being perswaded Christ was really absent from the Eucharist, they should submit their Reason without contradiction to a Fellow, who should come to publish, contrary to the Sentiments of the whole Earth, that Christ, who is indeed absent from the Symbols, is Really and Corporally present in them?

one of these degrees contains insupportable absurdities.

To begin with the first: If Prelacy was introduced by one or a few Persons, how is it possible their Name could remain unknown; or that they could propose such a surprising Alteration in the Government, without any Person's being astonished at it, or setting himself to oppose the same? Is it possible the Presbyters, Ruling Elders and Deacons did not at all perceive this rising Tyranny; or perceiving it, made no opposition there-to? How is it possible, that being perswaded the Church should be govern'd by Pastours acting in parity, they should submit their Reason without contradiction to one, who should publish contrary to the Opinion and Practice of all Christians, that the Church should be ruled by a Bishop?

‘ The Belief of other My-
 ‘ Mysteries, and the News steries, and the News of
 ‘ of God’s being made God’s becoming Man, &c.
 ‘ Man to save Sinners, had had the Opposition of
 ‘ the Opposition of Sense Sense and Reason to over-
 ‘ and Reason to overcome, come, and Prejudices, &c.
 ‘ and all these Prejudices could not be established
 ‘ the Souls of Men were without Books, Sermons,
 ‘ preingaged with; where- Disputes, Martyrs, &c.
 ‘ fore it made at first a Yet they would have us
 ‘ prodigious noise, and believe such a mighty
 ‘ raised the whole World Change could be made in
 ‘ against those, who the Government of the
 ‘ preached it, and could Church, even from Ari-
 ‘ not be established with- stocracy to Monarchy,
 ‘ out a great number of without either Sermons,
 ‘ Sermons, Disputes, Books Books, Disputes or Mar-
 ‘ Miracles, and the shed- tyrs; and tho’ Presbytery
 ‘ ding of the Blood of an was settled by the Apostles
 ‘ innumerable number of themselves, and remain’d
 ‘ Martyrs. Yet they would in possession without con-
 ‘ have us believe, that this troul for many Years; yet
 ‘ astonishing Novelty of Episcopacy might be set
 ‘ Christ’s being Corporal- up in all the Churches of
 ‘ ly present in an infinite the World without con-
 ‘ number of Places hand- tradiction, opposition or
 ‘ led by the Priests, enter- astonishment, and so much
 ‘ ing into the mouth of without any noise, that
 ‘ the Faithful, who re- the Authors and Time of
 ‘ ceive the Sacrament, this strange Innovation
 ‘ finding the whole Church have remain’d altogether
 ‘ in a contrary Opinion; unknown.
 ‘ and neither accompa-
 ‘ nied with Miracles nor
 ‘ Disputes, nor Books, nor
 ‘ Martyrs, was neverthe-
 ‘ less received in the whole
 ‘ World, without contra-
 ‘ diction;

' diction, opposition, asto-
, nishment, and so much
, without noise, that the
' Author and Time of this
' Innovation have re-
' main'd altogether un-
' known.

' But how came it, that
' they who abandoned the
' Ancient Belief of the
' Church to imbrace this
' Novelty, perceived not
' this Alteration? How is
' it that they did not write
' and testify they had
' been in an Error hither-
' to, believing Christ was
' not Corporally present
' in the Symbols after
' Consecration? How is it
' they accused not their
' Teachers of deceiving
' them treacherously? and
' that they cried not out
' with the Royal Prophet,
' *Verba iniquorum prava-*
' *luerunt super me?*

' Nevertheless nothing
' of all this is to be met
' with. For it is Matter
' of Fact, that since the
' time of the Apostles to
' that in which *Berenga-*
' *rius* lived, and in which
' the belief of the Real
' Presence was universal-
' ly received in the
' Church, we can find no
' proof

But how came it, that
they who abandoned the
Ancient Government of
the Church by Presbyte-
ry, to imbrace this No-
velty, perceived not the
Alteration? How is it
that they did not write
and testify, that they had
been in an Error hitherto
by wanting Bishops? How
came it that they accused
not their Pastours of de-
ceiving them wickedly,
and cryed not, *Verba ini-*
quorum, &c.

Nevertheless nothing
of all this is to be met
with. For it is Matter
of Fact, that since the
Apostles to the time
of *Aerius*, we can find
no proof that any in
publishing that Prelacy
is a Divine Institution,
thought he proposed an
Opinion in any thing dif-
ferent

proof, that any in publishing that Christ is Corporally present in the Eucharist, thought he proposed an Opinion in any thing different from the Common Belief of the Ancient Church, or that in his own time.

‘ It was never heard, that any was publicly delated to the Bishops or Councils for having published either by word or writing, that Christ was Corporally in the mouth of those who receive the Eucharist.

‘ It was never heard, that any Father, Bishop or Council troubled themselves with opposing this Opinion, testifying there were among the People, who were in a gross and dangerous Error, believing, to wit, That Christ was Corporally present in this World, whereas he was only in Heaven.

‘ It was never heard, that any Ecclesiastical Author or Preacher complained, that pernicious and damnable Idolatry crept in in his time, ‘ be-

It was never heard, that any was delated either to Presbyteries or General Assemblies, for having published either by word or writing, that Episcopacy was the Apostolical Government of the Church.

It was never heard, that any Father, Presbyter or Council whatsoever, troubled themselves with opposing Episcopacy, or testified that they who were advancing it were bringing in Antichristian Tyranny into the Church.

It was never heard, that any Ecclesiastical Author or Preacher complain’d, that a pernicious Alteration of the Presbyterian Government of the Church,

'because many adored Church was made, or beginning to be carried on
'Christ as Corporally pre- in his time, because some
'sent under the Species of the Bread and Wine. All were for setting up Bi-
'shops.
'the dogs were dumb, as
'says Mr. *Chillingworth*.

'Moreover, if we consider the Belief of the real Presence in these Chimerical Degrees, through which it behoved to pass according to the Presbyterian Supposition, before it could arrive at that height in which it was afterward, the extravagance of the Presbyterian Supposition will appear yet more insupportable. For it behoved necessarily to be, as was said, that there was a time in which the Belief of the Corporal Presence, which they suppose was not that of the Ancient Church, was so mix'd in the Church with the Belief of the real Absence, which they think was the true and ancient Opinion, that the one half of the Bishops, Priests and People, were of the one Opinion, and the other half of the other.

‘ Neither can it be sup-
 ‘ pos’d, this Division of
 ‘ Opinion and Mind was
 ‘ in different Provinces
 ‘ only, but it must be ad-
 ‘ mitted, according to the
 ‘ Calvinistical Suppositi-
 ‘ on, that in the same Pro-
 ‘ vinces, Cities, Churches,
 ‘ and Families, the Faith-
 ‘ ful were all divided with
 ‘ respect to the Eucharist,
 ‘ some believing Christ
 ‘ was really present in it,
 ‘ some that he is really ab-
 ‘ sent. And that this Di-
 ‘ vision was not only in the
 ‘ *Roman*, but the *Greek*,
 ‘ *Armenian*, and *Egyptian*
 ‘ Churches.

‘ If these Suppositions
 ‘ be join’d with Matter of
 ‘ Fact, which the Prote-
 ‘ stants can’t call in que-
 ‘ stion, to wit, That till
 ‘ *Berengarius* there was no
 ‘ rupture of Communion,
 ‘ nor any apparent Divi-
 ‘ sion on account of the
 ‘ Real Presence; the great-
 ‘ est absurdities will follow
 ‘ that can be imagined.
 ‘ For either it must be
 ‘ said, that this horrible
 ‘ and general Division re-
 ‘ main’d unknown to those
 ‘ who were so divided; or
 ‘ if it was known, was ne-
 ‘ glected

Neither can it be sup-
 pos’d, this Division of O-
 pinion and Practice was
 in different Provinces on-
 ly, but it must be admit-
 ted, according to the Pres-
 byterian Supposition, that
 in the same Provinces, Ci-
 ties, &c. the Faithful
 were all divided with re-
 spect to the Government,
 some believing that Epis-
 copacy was Apostolical,
 some that Presbytery.
 And that this Division
 was not only in the *Roman*
 Church, but the *Greek*, &c.

If these Suppositions be
 join’d with Matter of Fact,
 which the Presbyterians
 cannot deny, to wit, That
 till *Aerius* no Person ever
 oppos’d Prelacy, or doubt-
 ed of the Divine Institu-
 tion thereof, the greatest
 absurdities imaginable
 will follow. For either it
 must be suppos’d, that this
 general Division, with re-
 spect to the Government,
 remain’d unknown to
 Presbyters and People; or
 if it was known, was whol-
 ly neglected by both, so
 that they attempted no

‘glected by the Pastours, remedy. But both these
 ‘and did not oblige them Suppositions are contrary
 ‘to make the least noise to common Sense,
 ‘about it, or to offer the
 ‘smallest remedy. Yet
 ‘both the one and the o-
 ‘ther are so far contrary
 ‘to common Sense, that I
 ‘doubt any thinking Man
 ‘can believe such things.

‘To examine the first To examine the first,
 ‘Point, to wit, That this That this Division re-
 ‘Division remain’d un- main’d unknown. Is it pos-
 ‘known. Is it possible a sible a rational Man can
 ‘rational Man can per- persuade himself, there
 ‘swade himself, there was was a certain time when
 ‘a certain time, when in Brethren were oppos’d to
 ‘the Church Brethren Brethren, Wives to their
 ‘were oppos’d to Bre- Husbands, Presbyters to
 ‘thren, Wives to their Presbyters, not in one Pro-
 ‘Husbands, Priests to vince, but in all the Pro-
 ‘Priests, Bishops to Bi- vinces of the World; not
 ‘shops, not in one Pro- about a speculative Point,
 ‘vince, but in all the Pro- which few Persons con-
 ‘vinces of the World; not cern themselves with, but
 ‘about a speculative Point, the Government of the
 ‘which few Persons con- Church, which belongs to
 ‘cern themselves with, Practice; and yet no Per-
 ‘but of Practice; and yet son was sensible of such a
 ‘no Person was sensible of Division; not one Soul
 ‘such a Division; not one ever knew, that his Fa-
 ‘Soul ever knew, that his ther, Friend or Pastour
 ‘Father, Mother, Wife, was of an Opinion contra-
 ‘Friend or Bishop was of ry to his own in this Point?
 ‘an Opinion different That this strange Diver-
 ‘from himself? That this sity of Opinion should be
 ‘strange Diversity of O- wholly unknown, not a
 ‘pinion should be wholly Year only, but for many
 ‘un- Ages, But

unknown, not a Year only, but for many Ages.

‘ But if we suppose this diversity of Opinion was not unknown either to Pastours or Laity; it is yet more contrary to Reason, and all that can be gathered from Experience, to imagine, that this so strange a Division made no noise, and stir’d up no Disputes, that Pastours and People, tho’ divided among themselves about a Point of such importance as might have caused them to look on one another as Enemies, could nevertheless remain united in Communion and perfect Intelligence.

‘ Certainly if we suppose the Church could live in profound Peace in the mean time, when her Members were so strangely divided among themselves, we must also suppose the People of these times were of another Species than these of the present Generation, and were not liable to our Passions. For, all

‘ the

But if we suppose, that this diversity of Opinion about Episcopacy was not unknown either to Pastours or People, it is yet more contrary to Reason, and all that can be gathered from Experience, to imagine, that this so strange a Division made no noise, and stir’d up no Disputes, that Pastours & People, tho’ divided among themselves about a Point of such importance as might have caused them to look on one another as Enemies, could nevertheless remain united in Communion and perfect Amity, without any thing like *Pentland* or *Bothwell-bridge* work among them.

If we suppose the Church could live in profound Peace, when its Members were so divided, we must also suppose, that People then were of another Species than they of this Age. For it is impossible People now can hinder themselves to defend their own Opinion by Books and Disputes, and to endeavour the Conviction of these

' the knowledge we can these they judge to be
 ' have of the People now an Error, to accuse th
 ' living, obliges us to judge before Ecclesiastical T
 ' it is absolutely impossi- bunal, &c. which can
 ' ble, that Bishops, Priests but occasion noise
 ' and People, who look'd rupture of Communion
 ' on other as Enemies,
 ' could hinder themselves
 ' to defend every one their
 ' own Opinion by Books
 ' and Disputes, and to en-
 ' deavour to convince these
 ' they judge to be in an
 ' Error, or to accuse them
 ' before the Ecclesiastical
 ' Tribunals, and condemn
 ' them if they had Autho-
 ' rity, which could not be
 ' without noise and rup-
 ' ture of Communion.

' It necessarily follows, It necessarily follo
 ' the People of that Age, the Men of that Age
 ' if they could continue in they could continue
 ' such a deep sleep, notw such a deep sleep, notw
 ' withstanding such Dis- standing such Disuni
 ' union, had neither Cha- had neither Charity
 ' rity to their Neighbours, their Neighbours,
 ' Zeal for God, nor Ea- Zeal for God, &c. t
 ' gerness for their own is, they were not Men
 ' way, that is, they were know not what can m
 ' not Men, seeing these those, who are not tou
 ' Motions naturally carry ed by such Absurdities.
 ' People to endeavour to
 ' imprint upon others the
 ' Notions which they have
 ' themselves, & to oppose
 ' contrary Opinions with
 ' vehemence. I cannot tell
 ' what

what will touch those,
who cannot be moved by
such gross Absurdities.

I'm perswaded, the Reader is now beginning to be
asham'd of Mr. *Chillingworth's* Demonstration, and
inclines to pity the weakness of these, who suffer
themselves to be surpris'd by such a contemptible
Sophism; and that our Episcopal Friends will never
trouble us with it any more, nor so much as speak of
it before a Man of Sense: And if they should per-
swade the late Publiher of it to be at some pains to
gather together all the Copies thereof he can get,
and destroy them, perhaps they would do him no un-
friendly Office. I warrant this Demonstration pas-
ses current among the People of the Church of *Eng-
land*, as if it were Gospel. Certainly it is a pity,
that People should be so abus'd and impos'd upon
by their Great Doctors and Learn'd Clergy-men.

Whether there be Consanguinity or Affinity be-
tween Transubstantiation and modern Prelacy, I
know not; but sure I am one Argument serves them
both. Can one Egg be liker to another than Mr.
Chillingworth's Demonstration of Episcopacy is to
Mr. *Arnaud's* Demonstration of Transubstantiation?
And as little Solidity there is in the one as in the
other.

In like manner, the Arguments of the Prelatists
from the word *Episcopus*, or the distinction between
Bishops and Presbyters in the Writings of the Au-
thors of the 2d and 3d Centuries, are no better than
the Arguments of the Papists from *hoc est Corpus
meum*. Such Arguments do indeed prove, that there
were Ecclesiastical Officers call'd Bishops in those
Centuries, and that these Bishops were above those
who were call'd Presbyters; or that the Office of a
Bishop was superiour to that of a Presbyter, as the
Office of a Presbyter was superiour to that of a Dea-
con;

con; as the words *hoc est Corpus meum* prove, that *Christ* is present in the Eucharist. But they no more prove that there were such Bishops as are now pleaded for, or that there were Bishops in the modern sense in those Centuries; than *hoc est Corpus meum* proves that *Christ* is present in the Eucharist in the Popish sense.

In like manner also *J. S.* produces a number of Sentences out of *Cyprian's* Epistles, which seem to make for modern Prelacy in part, or for the absolute Power of Bishops, but it is well known that many more might be cited out of the Writings of the Fathers in the first five Centuries, which seem to make as much for Transubstantiation; and if the Letter be closely adhered to, and as rigidly urg'd in favours of Transubstantiation, as is by Mr. *Dodwel* and *J. S.* in favours of the Bishop's absolute Power, Sentences in great abundance might be produced out of the foresaid Fathers every whit as pat for the one, as any produced hitherto by these Authors for the other. We content our selves in the midst of such plenty, with one instance or two (e).

Cyril of Jerus: Catech: Mystagog: 4. saith after this manner. *Seeing then that Christ speaking of the Bread, declared that it was his Body, who shall dare to call in question this truth; and since that speaking of the VVine has assur'd us that it was his Blood, who can ever doubt of it? Or who shall dare say, 'tis not true it was his Blood? Christ being at Cana in Galilee, chang'd there the VVater into VVine by his will only; and shall we think it is not as worthy of Credit upon his own word, that he chang'd the VVine into his*

(e) Some please themselves with fancying there is as much, if not greater Evidence, that Episcopacy has been the Government of the Church ever since the time of the Apostles, than there is for the Canon of Scripture. This is to make a childish use of the ambiguity of the word *Bishop*. But if *Bishop* be taken in the modern sense, (to wit, for one who is over many Congregations, and has absolute Power over, or a negative Voice among the Pastors of these Congregations) it is evident, there is as much reason for believing, that *Transubstantiation* was the Faith of the Universal Church ever since the days of the Apostles, as that Episcopacy was the Government thereof

his own blood? VVherefore I conjure you, my Brethren, not to consider them any more as common Bread and VVine, since they are the Body and Blood of J̄esus Christ according to his VVord. For tho' your Sense inform you, that it is not so, yet Faith should perswade and assure you that it is so. Judge not therefore of this Truth by your taste, but let Faith make you believe with certainty, that you have been made worthy to partake of the Body and Blood of J̄esus Christ. Let your Soul rejoice in the Lord, being perswaded of it as a thing most certain, that the Bread which appears to your eyes, is not Bread, tho' your taste do judge it to be so, but that it is the Body of J̄esus Christ: and that the VVine which appears to your eyes is not VVine, tho' your sense of taste takes it for VVine, but that it is the Blood of J̄esus Christ.

And Ignatius in his Epistle to the Smyrneans, speaking of these Hereticks, who affirmed, that the Body of Christ was not a real Humane Body, and that he suffered only in appearance, says of them, They abstain from the publick Offices, and from the Holy Eucharist, because they confess it not to be the Flesh of our Saviour J̄esus Christ, which suffered for our sins, and which the Father, of his goodness, raised again from the dead.

Justin Martyr in his first Apologie, says, VVe do not receive it as common Bread and VVine, but as we know that J̄esus Christ our Saviour, who was made man by the VVord of God, took upon him Flesh and Blood for our Salvation, we also know that this Bread and VVine consecrated by the word of Prayer and Thanksgiving, which being changed nourishes our flesh and blood, is the Body and Blood of the same J̄esus, who was incarnated. For the Apostles in their VVritings, call'd the Gospels, declare that Christ commanded them, &c.

And Ambrose in his Book *De iis qui Mysteriis initiuntur*, Cap. 9. Afterwards you run to the Heavenly Feast, and see the Altar prepared, where you receive a Nourishment infinitely exceeding that of Manna, a Bread

more excellent than that of Angels. 'Tis the Flesh of Jesus Christ, the Body of Life; 'tis the incorruptible Manna, 'tis the Truth whereof the Manna was only the Figure. Perhaps you will tell me, But I see another thing: How do you assure me, that it is the Body of Jesus Christ which I receive? That we must prove. VVe must show that it is not the Body which Nature hath form'd, but that which the Benediction hath consecrated, and that the power of Benediction is greater than that of Nature, seeing Nature it self is changed by Benediction. Moses did hold the Rod, and cast it on the ground, and it became a Serpent. Again he did take the Serpent by the tail, and it return'd into the nature of a Rod. You see, that by the Prophetical Grace the nature of the Rod and Serpent was twice changed. And having mentioned other Miracles of this kind, he adds, If humane Benediction was so powerful, and changed Nature, what shall we say of the Divine Consecration, where the very words of God our Saviour do operate? For that Sacrament which you receive is made by the word of Christ. If the word of Elias was so powerful as to bring down fire from heaven, shall not the word of Christ be so efficacious as to change the Species of the Bread and VVine? You have read concerning the works of Creation, He spake, and it was done, he commanded, and they were created: Cannot the word of Christ then, which made these things to exist which were not, change these things which are into that which they were not? It requires no less power to give new Natures to things, than to change Natures, &c. And they who are acquaint with the Works of Chrysostome, know, that there are abundance of Sentences in them to this purpose, and which cannot be brought to a Protestant sense, but with some difficulty; nay, I may safely say, That it is more difficult to get some of these Sentences, which seem to favour Transubstantiation, brought to a Protestant sense, than it is to get any Sentences and Modes of Expression in Canons of Councils, or in the Works of Cyprian,

or

or of any Father that lived before, or a hundred years after him, which seem to favour modern Prelacy, brought to a Presbyterian sense, as will afterwards more fully appear.

Let any Person then compare thir Citations with these that *J. S.* gathers out of *Cyprian's* Epistles, and let him deny, if he can, that they sound as like the Corporal Presence in the Eucharist, as the others do like the Bishop's absolute Power. What would *J. S.* answer to a Jesuit, urging these or the like Sentences for Transubstantiation out of the Fathers? Would he not be forced to say some such thing as this, That the words of the Fathers must not be always taken in too strict a sense, and that the rigour of the letter must not be too much urged? or would he not be obliged to answer in *Chrysostome's* words, *We must not look only upon the Terms, but the Scope of him that speaks, the cause and occasion of his Discourse, and comparing all together, find out the sense and meaning of what is there contain'd?* Or that the meaning of what a Father says in some Places, cannot be always reached by the tenor of his words there, but must be gathered by just Consequences from what he says elsewhere, when he is speaking plainly and positively, or from what others of the Fathers say on the same head? And the same Answer do we give to *J. S.'s* Citations out of *Cyprian*, which seem to make for the Bishop's absolute Power.

It seems these things were not in *J. S.'s* view, when he said, *There are many very plain Assertions in the Cyprianick Monuments, which would seem so clearly to import the Bishop's absolute Power of giving Laws to his own Diocess, as perhaps it may trouble G. R. or any of his Party, solidly to avoid their tendency that way.* 'Tis good he said perhaps, for I hope to let him see before I have done, that any tendency that way, which some Sentences to be met with in *Cyprian's* Works, seem to have, may be avoided with the

84 *An Answer to Mr. Chillingworth's*

greatest facility imaginable, without any thing like offering violence to his words, or torturing them with strange and unusual Glosses.

AN

I'm hopeful *J. S.* will not be displeas'd now, if we call Mr. *Chillingworth's* Demonstration a Popish Argument, notwithstanding all his fine banter on this head in the 9 Ch. of his *Vindic.* The truth is, he runs on perpetual Mistakes in that Chapter, and rails on us most unjustly. We call not an Argument Popish merely because invented or improved by Papists or Jesuits, but that which proves some Popish Principle, as well as the thing our Prelatists adduce it for. If a Pagan or Jesuit invent a good Argument to prove the Existence of the Deity or the like, no Presbyterian rejects it as Popish or Heathenish, but will use it as his own with very good will. But if an Argument make as much for the Pope as the *English* Prelate, we Presbyterians will respect it as Popish, with *J. S.*'s good leave, tho' it be coin'd lately at *Oxford* by Mr. *Dodwell*, and no Papist or Jesuit ever heard of it. As to our King killing Doctrines, &c. which he objects there, they are but groundless Aspersions; Presbyterians maintain no King-killing Doctrines, but what the Church of *England* defends, and owns by her Practice (for I reckon she has exploded the Doctrine of *Non-resistance*) And the Principles of the Presbyterians or Church of *England*, as to this particular, have no affinity with the detestable Doctrine of *Mariana*. *Mariana* teaches, That the Pope has a Right to depose Kings when they oppose his Interest. But will it follow, because the Pope has no Right to depose a King, the Nation represented in Parliament (that creates the King, and gives him what Authority he has over others) has no Right to do it, when the King breaks the Fundamental Laws, and endeavours to destroy the Liberty of the Subject, or overturn Religion? *J. S.* discovers as much ill-nature and want of temper in that Chapter, as any where in his whole Book.

See *Vindicat. of the Learning, Loyalty, &c. of the Dissenters*, Part 2. C. 5 by *Samuel Palmer*, a judicious and snell Author.

A N APPENDIX, WHEREIN

It is made evident, That not only the Episcopal Diocesses or Churches, were single Congregations only in the days of Cyprian, but that it was reckon'd a Crime then, and even to destroy a Church, to erect a Congregation in it besides the Bishop's Congregation: By way of Addition to Chap: 3. pag. 47.

IT will appear yet more evidently, That the Episcopal Diocesses in Cyprian's time, were Congregational Churches, and the Bishops Pastours of one Congregation only, if it be considered, that the two Schismatical Bishops, *Fortunatus* and *Novatianus*, the one at *Carthage*, and the other at *Rome*, were but Congregational Bishops both of them; and that no Objection was made against them on that score, either by *Cyprian* or *Cornelius*, which they would not have fail'd to have done, if it had been look'd on as an Abuse, or been a thing contrary to the practice of the Church at that time, that one should pretend to be a Bishop, who had but a single Congregation under his Charge.

In the first place I say, that *Fortunatus* at *Carthage* and *Novatianus* at *Rome*, were but Congregational Bishops. To begin with *Carthage*, the Schismatical

tical Church or Diocess of *Fortunatus* there, was one Congregation only. This is evident; for the whole Schismatical Faction there, or all these that own'd the Episcopacy of *Fortunatus*, us'd to assemble together for Worship in a Mountain, *Comminatus quod secum in monte non communicarent qui nobis obtemperare voluissent*, Epist. 41. But perhaps they assembled themselves in the Mountain in several distinct Congregations. I say no: For *Cyprian* call'd them a Conventicle only, or, *A little private Assembly*; *Nisi foris sibi extra Ecclesiam & contra Ecclesiam constituissent Conventiculum perditæ factionis, cum male sibi consciorum, & Deum rogare, ac satisfacere nolentium caterva conflueret*, Ep. 59. p. 135. And Bishop *Fell* says, that the Mountain in which they kepted their Meetings, was a certain Place in the City, call'd the Mountain, *Et fortassis*, saith he, *in illa Urbis parte Felicissimus * conventus suos habebat*: So that he reckon'd them to be but one Congregation. Then says *Cyprian*, Ep. 41, *Instinctu suo quietem Fratrum turbans, proripuerit se cum plurimis*: If the Faction had consisted of more Congregations than one, *Cyprian* would not have said, *Proripuerit se CUM PLURIMIS*, but that he did withdraw together with several Congregations. And Ep. 52. he says of *Novatus* (another great Carrier on of the Schismatical Faction) *Qui apud nos primum discordiæ & Schismatis incendium seminavit, qui quosdam istic ex Fratribus ab Episcopo segregavit*: This *quosdam* sounds not as if several Congregations of *Cyprian's* Diocess had separated from him.

But if you would have this made more evident or proven, so as to convince all, even the most obstinate among us, and those who are most prejudic'd in favours of Diocesses consisting of many particular

Con-

* To avoid confusion here, it is to be observed, that *Felicissimus* the Deacon, was the principle Ring-leader of the Faction, and it was through his Instigation mainly, that the Schismatics did break off from *Cyprian*, and when they had remained a Separate Congregation by themselves for some time, they made *Fortunatus* their Bishop.

Congregations; turn over to Ep. 59, pag. 137, and you will find *Cyprian* declaring positively, that there were not so many People in that whole Diocess, or Schismatical Church, as there were Bishops, Presbyters and Deacons, in the Synod that condemned them, *Si eorum, qui de illis priore anno judicaverunt numerus cum Presbyteris & Diaconis computetur, plures tunc affuerunt iudicio & cognitioni, quam sunt iidem isti qui cum Fortunato nunc videntur esse conjuncti.*

And seeing the Diocess of *Cyprian* himself was so small, that he was acquainted with the particular Circumstances of all the People in it, knew who were in a good Condition as to the World, who were poor and could not work, and behoved to be maintained out of the Publick; and who could work little only, and requir'd some help for their sustentation: *Cumque ego vos pro me Vicarios miserim, & expungeretis necessitates Fratrum nostrorum sumptibus, si qui etiam vellent suas artes exercere, additamentum quantum satis esset, desideria eorum juvaretis; simul etiam aetates eorum, & conditiones, & merita discernetis; ut jam nunc ego cui cura incumbit, omnes optime nossem, & dignos quoque & humiles & mites ad Ecclesiasticæ administrationis officia promoverem.* † Seeing, I say, the Diocess of *Cyprian* was so small, what can we reckon the Diocess of *Fortunatus*, which was only a small part of *Cyprian*'s, but a very little inconsiderable Congregation?

As to the Schismatical Church, or Diocess at *Rome*, it was but one Congregation only in like manner. Thus *Cyprian* writes to *Cornelius* in Epist. 52. that the foresaid *Novatus* sail'd to *Rome* to overturn the Church there, rending a Portion of the People from the Clergy, and stirring up Division among the Brethren; and that as *Rome* for greatness did far surpass

Car-

† Epist. 41. Ex istis enim qui in pauperum matricula erant, ostiarii & minorum Gentium Clerici eligebantur. Quæ res ad æconomiam Ecclesiasticam compendia spectabat. Oxoniens. Epist. in Notis.

88 *An Answer to Mr. Chillingworth's*

Carthage, so he created greater Disturbances there. And what was the business? *Qui isthic adversus Ecclesiam Diaconum fecerat, illic Episcopum fecit*, that whereas he set up but a Deacon at *Carthage*, he set up a Bishop at *Rome*. And if the Schismatical Diocess at *Rome* had consisted of several distinct Congregations, would not *Cyprian* have as readily said, That whereas he set up a Faction at *Carthage* consisting but of one Congregation, he set up a Faction at *Rome* consisting of many Congregations? Then, when *Novatianus* wrote to *Dionysius* Bishop of *Alexandria*, excusing himself as if he had not been the cause of the Disorders in the Church of *Rome*, he said to him, That he was forced to take the Episcopal Office upon him there, by some of the Members of that Church, as *Eusebius* gives Account, *Eccl. Hist. l. 6. c. 45.* Ἐπεδὴ ἐν τῷ χάσματι προέφασιν ἐποιεῖτο τῇ ἀδελφῶν τινά, ὥς δὴ πρὸς αὐτῇ ἐπὶ τῷ ἐλθεῖν ἐκβεβιάσμενος. If *Novatianus* could have said, That several Congregations of the Church of *Rome* forced the Episcopacy upon him, that would have tended much more to his justification; wherefore if he had had several Congregations there on his side, he would not have contented himself with saying only, That some of the Brethren violented him.

But that the thing may be put beyond all doubt, let the 49 Ep. be consider'd, which is from *Cornelius* to *Cyprian*; therein he gives him account of the return of severals of the Schismatics to the Church, and of the way and manner of their Reception; and he tells *Cyprian* in the first place, That some of the Brethren informed, that these Schismatics were beginning to relent. Then he gives account, that two of them came to some of the Presbyters, and signified, that they were desirous to be received into the Church. And this not being satisfactory, it was judged requisite, that the Schismatical Brethren should come personally, and declare out of their

their own mouth, these things which they signified by the persons they did send: *Ex ipsorum ore & confessione, ista quæ per legationem mandaverunt, placuit audiri*. When all this was laid before Cornelius, he called together the Ptesbytery; *Omni igitur actu ad me perlato*, saith he, *placuit contrahi Presbyterium*. After the Affair was laid before the Presbytery, and was fully debated and consulted there, it was brought to the People to be ratified, or concluded by their Suffrages; *Quoderat consequens*, says Cornelius; *Omnis hic Actus Populo fuerat insinuandus*. And when the Church was conven'd, or the People did meet, the Schismaticks appeared before them, and own'd Cornelius's Episcopacy publickly. *Nos*, say they, *Cornelium Episcopum sanctissimæ Catholicæ Ecclesiæ, electum a Deo Omnipotente, & Christo Domino nostro scimus*, and confessed their Fault before the whole Church, *Nos*, say they, *errorem nostrum confitemur, nos imposturam passi sumus, circumventi sumus perfidia & loquacitate capiosa, &c.* And upon this fair Confession, and publick Profession of their Repentance, they were absolved, and received into the Peace of the Church, by the Votes or Suffrages of the whole Fraternity; *Quapropter Maximum Presbyterum locum suum agnoscere iussimus, cæteros cum ingenti populi suffragio recepimus* †. This is so very clear, that I think no Man of sense, or common honesty, will deny, that Cornelius's Church, or the Roman Diocess, was a

M Con-

† I. S. tells us, p. 396. That the very sound of the words opposeth us here, it being impossible, says he, without a mighty Violence, to bend the [*ingens Populi suffragium*] to the sense of a popular Vote. It seems he has a very nice ear. For my part, I cannot be perswaded, that thir words would have sounded so harsh in the ears of *Virgil*, who tells us of *Ingens obsequio*, *Æn. l. 8.*

*Nec non Tarquinium ejellum Porfenna jubebat
Accipere, ingentisque Urbem obfitione premebat.*

And he says, that *suffragium* signifieth no more but *gaudium*, because *Cyprian* says, *Merito in hoc summo, ut scribitur, gaudio & Clerus, & Plebs, & Fratritas omnis exultat*. As if there were an Opposition between *gaudium* and *suffragium*; so that if they admitted them with joy, they could not be said to have admitted them by their Votes. If I. S. can satisfy himself with such Reasons as these, he is easily satisfied, and has acquir'd the Faculty of making his judgment wholly subject to his will.

Congregational Church at that time, receiving some of her wandring Members into Communion again. Perhaps it may be urged here, that *Cornelius* did not assemble all the People in his Diocess on this occasion, but only some that were readiest, or only one Congregation of his Diocess: But it will be needless to repeat in this place, what we have said in page 33, and 34. for confutation of such a disingenuous Objection. Tho *Cyprian* was not in *Rome* at that time, he knew very well by the constant and common Practice, that these Schismatics were received into Communion by the whole Fraternity of the Church, or Diocess of *Rome*; thus in his Answer to *Cornelius's* Letter (*Ep. 51.*) he says, *Merito illos revertentes summo ut scribis, gaudio & Clerus & Plebs & Fraternitas omnis excepit.* Who will imagine, that all the People of a Diocesan Church of the modern Fashion, were convened, to receive a few Schismatics into Communion? It is notoriously evident then, that the Church of *Rome*, or Diocess of *Cornelius*, was a Congregational Church; and much more was the Diocess of *Novatianus* such, which was but a small Portion of *Cornelius's* Diocess.

Neither did it ever enter into the thoughts of *Cyprian* and *Cornelius*, to object against *Fortunatus* or *Novatianus*, that their Diocesses were single Congregations only; or to pretend on that account, that they were not, or could not be reckon'd Bishops: They did lay a hundred things to their charge, they left no stone unturn'd, they omitted nothing they could invent, to perswade all the Christians in the world to disown them, and to look on them as no Bishops. *Cyprian* in his *Ep. to Antonianus* says (pag. 104) That *Cornelius* was made Bishop by the judgment of God and of his Christ, the Testimony of the Clergy, the Suffrages of the People, and by the College of the Bishops; and that, when there was no Bishop of *Rome* at the time, when the Place of

Fabian, that is, of *Peter*, was empty, and the Degree of the Episcopal Chair was vacant. And hence he concludes, that *Novatianus* could not pretend to be Bishop of *Rome*. *Quo occupato*, saith he, *de Dei voluntate, atque omnium nostrum consensione confirmato, quisquis jam Episcopus fieri voluerit, foris fiat necessesse est; nec habeat Ecclesiasticam Ordinationem, qui Ecclesiæ non tenet unitatem; quisquis ille fuerit multum de se licet jactans, & sibi plurimum vindicans, profanus est, alienus est, foris est; & cum post primum secundus esse non possit, quisquis post unum qui solus esse debeat, factus est, non jam secundus ille, sed nullus est.* In like manner, *Cornelius* in his Epistle to *Fabius* Bishop of *Antioch*, (which you have *Euseb. Eccl. Hist. l. 6. c. 43.*) says a world of things against him. But it never enter'd the head either of *Cyprian* or *Cornelius*, to acquaint the Churches, that the Diocesses of *Fortunatus* and *Novatian*, were only single Congregations; a thing which it is not possible they would have omitted, if it had been an unusual thing in those days, or any way contrary to common practice of the Church, to ordain Bishops who had but one single Congregation for their Diocess. If it be thought, that *Fortunatus's* and *Novatianus's* Diocesses, being single Congregations only, proves not, that all the Episcopal Diocesses in the world then, were only Congregational Churches; I answer, That their Diocesses, and *Cyprian's* and *Cornelius's* too, being only Congregational Churches, proves it; and that *Fortunatus's* and *Novatianus's* Diocesses being single Congregations both of them, and no Objection being made against them on that account, by any in that Age, even their greatest Enemies, proves to a Demonstration, that according to the Principles of the third Age, persons may be Bishops who have but Congregational Diocesses; and that it is nothing but ignorance, or meer obstinacy and wickedness, that hinders some among us

to believe, that the Presbyterian Ministers, are real proper Diocesan *Cyprianick* Bishops.

Then, what think you could induce these Schismatical Churches we are speaking of, or these two Congregations, to set up Bishops to themselves? Might they not have satisfied themselves with Presbyters, as almost all the Parishes or Congregations in the world do now? Certainly, their setting up Bishops to themselves is an undoubted Evidence, that Presbyters were not look'd on as Pastours, and did not officiate as such then, in the Christian Congregations or Assemblies, and shew, that it was then the common and universally received Principle, that every Assembly, or distinct Congregation whatsoever, should have a Bishop, a Presbytery, and an Altar or a Communion-Table. Thus the Donatistical Party at *Rome*, tho a very small and inconsiderable Congregation, sent for a Bishop from *Africa*, one *Vittor Farbensis*, *qui illos colligeret*, as says *Optat.* l. 2. that is, that he might assemble them, or officiate as Pastour among them.

Nay I will say more: Not only were all the Episcopal Diocesses in *Cyprian's* time Congregational Churches, but it was reckon'd a Crime in those days, so much as to offer to divide an Episcopal Diocess into particular Congregations; it was look'd on as a very wicked and abominable thing then, to have more Congregations than one in a Diocess, or any Congregation in it besides the Bishop's Congregation. And this is evident, because *Cyprian* calls the setting up that separate Congregation in his Diocess, A dividing of a Portion of the People with him, *Cum Episcopo portionem Plebis dividere*, i. e. saith he, *A Pastore oves, & filios a Parente separare, & Christi Membra dissipare*, Ep. 41.

It will be answer'd, That *Cyprian* calls not the setting up a separate Congregation in the Diocess, to divide a Portion of the People with the Bishop, and to dis-

disperse the Members of Christ; but the setting up a separate Congregation independent on the Bishop, and which refuses Subjection to him. Thus, whereas *Ignatius* says, *One Altar to every Church, and one Bishop and Presbytery*, they tell us, that *Ignatius* is likewise contradicted, tho ten thousand Altars should be set up in every Church, providing these Altars be all of them subject to the Bishop, and subordinate to his supreme Altar.

But this Answer is as groundless and impertinent, as that which they give to the saying of *Ignatius*. Very true it is, that separate Congregation which *Feliciſſimus* did erect, refus'd Subjection to Bishop *Cyprian*, but it is as true, that *Feliciſſimus's* separating that People from the Congregation of *Cyprian*, and causing them assemble apart, would have been as dividing a Portion of the People with *Cyprian*, tho they had remained in subjection to him. If a Bishop had a Congregational Diocess, and if it became so numerous at length, that it could not conveniently assemble in one Place, if he should divide it into two parts, should preach and administer the Sacraments to one part thereof himself, and set up a Presbyter to preach and administer the Sacraments as Pastour in Ordinary to the other part thereof, assembling always in another Place; would not that be to divide the People between himself and that Presbyter, and would not that Presbyter divide a Portion of the Flock with the Pastour? The taking part of the Bishop's People then, and assembling them separately and by themselves, or in a distinct Congregation, is what *Cyprian* call'd, *to divide a Portion of the People with the Bishop*, whether they remain'd in subjection to the Bishop as to Government or not. In the next place,

If this Answer be relevant, or if the setting up a Congregation independent on the Bishop as to Government, be the thing that *Cyprian* calls, *To divide*

a Portion of the People with the Bishop, the injury done to *Cyprian* did not lie in setting up a separate Congregation, but setting up a Congregation independent on him as to Government. But so it is, that *Cyprian* never complains, that they set up a Congregation independent on him as to Government, but that they set up a separate Meeting, and assembled apart by themselves: he never distinguishes between the setting up a separate Congregation, and the setting up a Congregation not owning subjection to him: He never so much as insinuates, that he was not offended at their separating or setting up a Congregation by themselves, but at their setting up a Congregation that was not lyable to his Jurisdiction: But where ever he has occasion to complain of the injury, he complains of it in words, which level directly at their setting up a separate Meeting, another Congregation, and which touch not a Congregation not subordinate to him, as such, or because it refused Subordination or Subjection to him.

And this is further evident, because he calls the setting up a separate Congregation in the Diocess of *Rome*, *A pulling away a Portion of the People from the Clergy*, Ep. 52. p. 97. *Romam quoque ad evertendam Ecclesiam navigans, similia illic & paria molitus est, a Clero portionem Plebis avellens, Fraternitatis bene sibi coherentis & se invicem diligentis concordiam scindens*. If the thing *Cyprian* complains of, was the setting up a Congregation independent as to Government on the Bishop, he might have call'd it a pulling away a Portion of the People from the Bishop, but not a pulling away a Portion of the People from the Clergy. For when a new Congregation is erected in an Episcopal Diocess, the People or it are always taken away from the Clergy, however dependent they remain as to Government on the Bishop. For example, the People in *Newcastle* de

depend no more on the Clergy in *Berwick* and *Anwick*, than the People in *Berwick* and *Anwick* depend on the Clergy of *Newcastle*. Then, *Fraternitas bene sibi coherens & se invicem diligentis concordiam vindens*, makes it appear, that the setting up of these People into a Congregation independent as to Government on the Bishop, was not the ground of the Complaint, but the parting of them from the Congregation they were in before. There is a Coherence, as *Cyprian* expresseth it among the People who assemble in one Congregation, and communicate at one Table, and receive the Mysteries from one hand, and by their mutual Christians converse, occasion is given to the exercise of mutual Brotherly Love among 'em. But there is but very little Coherence between the Christians in *Berwick* and the Christians in *Durham*, tho' both these Places be under the Jurisdiction of one Bishop; and there is little occasion for the exercise of Brotherly Love among the People in *Durham* and *Berwick*, as among the People in *Durham* and *York*.

Then, that the Crime the Schismaticks were guilty of, did ly in their setting up a separate Congregation, and not in withdrawing from obedience to the Bishop, or meerly in setting up a Congregation independent on him as to Government, is yet further evident from what was proposed to them, and required of them in order to their being received, and admitted again to the Church, and from what they actually did when they return'd to the Church. If their Crime did ly meerly in withdrawing from obedience to the Bishop, and setting up a Congregation independent on him as to Government; no more would have been required of them, or propos'd to them, but a returning to the obedience of the Bishop, their subjecting themselves to his Government, or putting themselves under his Episcopal Jurisdiction, they remaining a separate Con-

Congregation still. But that was never propos'd to them at all, nor so much as motion'd directly or indirectly. It was never propos'd to them to make their Congregation subject to the Bishop (as other Congregations in the Diocese were) or to condescend that it should be under his Episcopal Jurisdiction. It was never propos'd to them, that they should put away the Schismatical Bishop and Presbyters, and admit or receive another Presbyter or Presbyters in their room, that would be subject to the Government of the Bishop. It was never propos'd, that the Schismatical Bishop should content himself with the rank of a Presbyter, that he should continue to officiate as Pastour in that new Congregation, on condition that he would act or officiate therein in subordination to the Bishop as other Presbyters. Nothing of this I say, or like this was proposed to them, or required of them. But the thing that was propos'd to them, and urged always, was this and this only, that they should return to the Mother Church, from which they had separated themselves by setting up a new Congregation. Thus *Cyprian* to the *Roman* Confessours, who had separated from *Cornelius*, *Ad matrem revertamini unde prodiiistis.* Ep. 46.

Let it not be thought, that by *returning to the Church*, *Cyprian* understood no more but a returning to the Bishop's Obedience, or a putting their Congregation under the Episcopal Jurisdiction again. This returning implied a dissolving the separate Congregation, and a joining themselves to the Bishop's Congregation, remaining constant Members thereof for the future, and partaking of the Divine Ordinances dispersed by him. This is evident from *Cyprian's* Threatning, Ep. 41. *Sed & quisquis se conspirationi & factioni ejus adjunxerit; sciat se in Ecclesia Nobiscum non communicaturum:* If they returned then, they were to communicate with *Cyprian* in
the

the Church as other Members of his Congregation: And this is further evident from what they did actually, or from the way they were received, when they did return. *Cyprian* gives account thereof to *Cornelius* in Ep. 59. *O si posses, Frater carissime, istic interesse nobiscum, cum pravi isti & perversi de Schismate revertuntur, videres quis mihi labor sit persuadere patientiam Fratribus nostris, ut animi dolore sopito, recipiendis malis curandisque consentiant. Namque ut gaudent & lætantur cum tolerabiles & minus culpabiles redeunt, ita contra fremunt & reluctantur quoties protervi & sacrificiis contaminati, sic ad Ecclesiam remeant, ut bona intus ingenia corrumpant. Vix Plebi persuadeo imo extorqueo, ut tales patiantur admitti.* When they return'd to the Church then, they returned to the Bishop's Congregation, and were received to be Members thereof, as they were before they separated.

Moreover, that the Crime of these Schismatics did lie precisely in their setting up another Congregation in the Diocese, beside that of the Bishop, might be made further to appear from several things, which *Cyprian* drops here and there in his Epistles. Thus in Ep. 43. he says, *Deus unus est, & Christus unus, & una Ecclesia, & Cathedra una, super Petram Domini voce fundata, aliud Altare constitui, aut sacerdotium novum fieri præter unum Altare, & unum sacerdotium non potest. Quisquis alibi collegerit, spargit.* By *alibi colligere* here *Cyprian* understands the setting up another Congregation besides that of the Bishop. And he says not, *Quisquis alibi collegerit invito Episcopo*, or, *Quisquis alibi collegerit cætum independentem ab Episcopo*, but, *Quisquis alibi collegerit*. Wherefore he reckons the very setting up of another Congregation besides that of the Bishop, to disperse the Brethren, and to scatter them from *Jesus Christ*. And he says, *Quisquis*, that is, Whoever that Person may be, *qui alibi collegerit*, or who gathers an

Assembly out of the Bishop's Congregation, or acts as Pastour therein, whatever Title he may take to himself, whether that of *Bishop* or *Presbyter*, *spargit*, he is a Diffipatour and Scatterer of the People of the Lord.

And in the same Epistle he says of these Schismatics, *Ut a nobis non ejecti, ultro se ejicerent*. He calls their setting up a separate Congregation, *Ultro se ejicere*, viz. *ex Ecclesia*, a throwing themselves out of the Church: And it is evident that he calls their setting up a *separate Congregation*, and not a *Congregation independent on the Bishop as to Government*, to throw themselves out of the Church. For if *ultro se ejicerent* be interpreted, *They set up a Congregation independent on the Bishop*, then the other words, *a nobis non ejecti*, must be interpreted, *Tho' we did not consent that they should separate, and did not erect them into a Congregation independent as to Government*. And if this be the meaning of *a nobis non ejecti*, it will follow according to *Cyprian*, that if a Bishop erect a Congregation in his Diocess independent on him as to Government, he throws that Congregation out of the Church. But there is no reason to think that the erecting a Congregation in a Diocess independent on the Bishop as to Government, is a throwing it out of the Church, more than to erect a Congregation in a Diocess independent on the Bishop as to the preaching of the Word, and administration of the Sacraments, is a throwing that Congregation out of the Church.

It is evident then, that the precise thing for which *Cyprian* blam'd these Separatists, and on the account of which he exclaim'd so much against them, was this, that *they erected a separate Congregation*, set up a Congregation in the Diocess besides the Bishop's Congregation. And he not only exclaims against dividing a Diocess into distinct Congregations, or the having more Congregations in

a Diocess than one, as an unusual thing, a thing contrary to the Practice of the Universal Church hitherto; but he exclaims against it as a very great Wickedness, and a most detestable Crime. He calls it not only to divide a Portion of the People with the Bishop, but to dissipate the Members of Jesus Christ, *Et Christi membra dissipare tentaverit*. He calls it to tear the Concord of the Fraternity. *Fraternitatis bene sibi coherentis concordiam scindere*. He calls it Sedition, and a disturbing the Peace of the Brethren, *Quietem Fratrum turbans, proripuerit se cum plurimis, ducem se factionis, & seditionis Principem temerario furore contestans*. Ep. 41. A Persecution & Tentation, *Persecutio est hæc alia, & alia tentatio*, Ep. 43. A Conspiracy, *Sed & quisquis se conspirationi & factioni ejus adjunxerit*. Epist. 41. A driving themselves out of the Church, *conjurati & scelerati de Ecclesia sponte se pellerent*. Ep. 43. He calls it Schism, *Cum pravi isti & perversi de Schismate revertuntur*. Heresie, *Et se hæreticæ factioni adjunxerit*, Ep. 43. An overturning of the Church, *Romam ad everiendam Ecclesiam navigans*. This he calls *Novatus's* going to Rome, and being instrumental in setting up a separate Congregation in *Cornelius's* Diocess, Ep. 52. He calls it, *Contra sacerdotium Dei portionem ruptæ Fraternitatis armare, &c.* From all which Expressions, (and many more of this kind might be gathered together) you may judge what a Crime it was in the Opinion of *Cyprian*, and horrible wickedness, to have more Congregations in a Diocess, than the Bishop's Congregation.

And the venerable Synod of *Antioch* (which was assembled there, about 16 years after the meeting of the *Nicene* Synod) was of the same Opinion with *Cyprian* as to this Particular: They reckon'd it an intolerable piece of insolence, to have more Congregations in a Diocess than the Bishop's Congregation, call'd the setting up a separate Congregation to des-

pise the Bishop, and look'd on it as a Crime punishable with an Anathema: This is evident from their 5. Canon, which is thus: *Si quis Presbyter aut Diaconus, Episcopum proprium contemnens, se ab Ecclesia segregaverit, & privatim, apud se collectis populis Altare erigere AUSUS, FUERIT* (ἀφώρισεν ἑαυτὸν τῆς ἐκκλησίας καὶ ἰδιαύτως συναγαγεν καὶ δυσιασήμερον ἔστησεν) *& nihilominus Episcopo exhortante & semel & iterum revocante, inobediens exiiterit; hunc modis omnibus deponendum, nec aliquando consequi curationem, aut proprium honorem recipere speret. Quod si etiam perseveraverit, conturbans & concitans Ecclesiam, per eam quæ foris est potestatem, hunc tanquam seditiosum corripere oportet.* It will be told us here in like manner, that this Canon prohibits only the setting up a Congregation in a Diocess independent as to Government on the Bishop, or an Altar not subordinate to the Bishop's supreme Altar. But this Answer is plainly ridiculous.

It is a known and true Maxim, *Non distinguendum est ubi Lex non distinguit.* If persons may be allow'd to distinguish where the Law distinguisheth not, by this means, any Law may be render'd ineffectual. Thus the Law of God prohibits giving of Divine Worship to the Creature: And when we urge the Papists with this, and tell them, That they should not worship the Virgin or the Saints: They answer, That they worship not the Virgin or the Saints, with the worship of Latræ. But say we, You must not distinguish where the Law distinguisheth not: The Law says not, you must not worship Creatures with the Worship of Latræ, but, you must not worship Creatures. We give the same Answer to the Prelatists. The Canon of this Synod prohibits not the setting up a Congregation independent, as to Government on the Bishop, but prohibits the setting up another Congregation; it says not, You shall not set up an Altar that is not subordinate to the Bishop's Altar,

Altar; but you shall not set up an Altar, to wit, in the Bishop's Diocese or Church.

Then the Synod prohibits any Presbyter to set up an Altar, or erect a new Congregation in the Diocese *despising the Bishop*, that is, withdrawing the People from his Congregation, on pretence, he is not qualified sufficiently for the Pastoral Work, or the like: But says nothing of *despising the Presbyters*, or of withdrawing the People from their Congregations. Wherefore they manifestly suppose, That the Presbyters had not peculiar Congregations, or that there was no Congregation in the Diocese, besides that in which the Bishop himself officiated as Pastour. And they call a Presbyter's setting up a Congregation in a Diocese distinct from the Bishop's Congregation, *Despising the Bishop*, καταφρονήσας τῷ Ἐπισκόπῳ τῷ ἰδίῳ whereby they make it appear, that they looked upon the setting up a Congregation in a Diocese besides that of the Bishop, as a small Crime.

To the same purpose, the thirtieth of these Canons that are call'd Apostolical, Εἰ τις πρεσβύτερος καταφρονήσας τῷ ἰδίῳ Ἐπισκόπῳ χωρὶς, συναγωγὴν ἢ θυσιαστήριον πηξῇ μηδὲν κατεγνωκώς τῷ Ἐπισκόπῳ ὑποβίβεια καὶ δικαιοσύνη, καθαιρεῖται ὡς φίλαρχος, Τύραννος γὰρ ὅστις. i. e. If any Presbyter despising his own Bishop, set up a separate Congregation, and erect an Altar, there being nothing of impiety or injustice that he can lay to his Bishop's charge, let him be depos'd as a person that loves to govern: For he is a Tyrant. Hence it is evident,

1. It cannot be thought, that at that time when this Canon was compos'd, or look'd on as any ways obligatory in the Church, that the Presbyters had Congregations of their own in which they officiated as constant Pastours, unless it be suppos'd, that all the Bishops then were profane, or such as that it could not be expected, the People would be edify'd by their

their Ministry: for it was in that case alienably, that it was licent to any Presbyter, to have a Congregation in a Diocess distinct from the Bishop's Congregation. If any Presbyter, says the Canon, set up a separate Congregation and erect an Altar, having nothing of impiety or injustice to lay to his Bishop's charge, let him be depos'd.

2. Wherever there was a Christian Congregation in those days, having an Altar of its own, or Communion-Table; that Congregation had Government, or the Exercise of Discipline in it. This necessarily followeth from the words of this Canon; for if it had been otherwise, a Presbyter who set up a Congregation distinct from the Bishop's Congregation, could not be condemn'd *ὡς φιλαρχος*, or as one that was ambitious to rule; nor could he reckon'd a Tyrant for such an Action or Fact. It would be plain mockery, or downright impertinency and folly, to call an English Presbyter a Tyrant, seeing he has no exercise of Government at all in his Congregation. And I think we may adduce

Apolog. pro
Christi. Cap.
39.

Tertullian as a witness here, *Corpus sumus*, saith he, *de conscientia Religionis, & Disciplinæ unitate, & Spei fœdere*. Coimus in Coetum & Congregationem, ut ad Deum quasi manu facta precationibus, ambiamus orantes. Hæc vis Deo grata est. Oramus etiam pro Imperatoribus, pro Ministris eorum, & potestatibus, pro statu seculi, pro rerum quiete, pro mora finis: cogimur ad Divinarum literarum commemorationem, si quid præsentium temporum qualitas aut præmonere cogit, aut recognoscere. Certe fidem sanctis vocibus pascimus, spem erigimus, fiduciam figimus, disciplinam præceptorum nihilominus inculcationibus densamus; ibidem etiam Exhortationes, castigationes, & censura Divina, nam & judicatur magno cum pondere, ut apud certos de Dei conspectu, summumque futuri judicii præjudicium est, si quis ita deliquerit, ut a Communicatione Orationis, & Conventus, & omnis

nis ſancti Commercii relegetur. Wherever then, there were publick Prayers, reading of the Scriptures, or preaching of the Goſpel, (that is in every diſtinct Chriſtian Congregation) there was alſo the infliction of Cenſures, or the Exerciſe of Diſcipline, and the power of Excommunication.

And hereby, now the whole Scheme or Frame of the *English* Prelacy is totally overturned : For they have no infliction of Divine Cenſures, (as *Tertullian* ſpeaks) no Exerciſe of Diſcipline in their particular Congregations, or Pariſh Churches. The *English* Episcopal Government then, is of a nature quite different from the Episcopal Government in the 2d. or 3d. Centuries. Nay, the Episcopal Government in the 2d. and 3d. Centuries, was of the ſame nature, with that which is call'd Presbyterian Government in *Scotland* at this day ; for in every Congregation, or Pariſh Church in *Scotland*, there are *Exhortationes, caſtigatıones, & cenſura divina, & judicatur magnum pondere, &c.*

Hereby alſo, the Frame or Conſtitution of the *ate Scottish* Prelacy is wholly ſubverted : For there was infliction of Cenſures, or exerciſe of Diſcipline, in every particular Congregation in the 2d. or 3d. Century. But there was no exerciſe of Diſcipline, or infliction of Cenſures in theſe Centuries, but by Biſhop and Preſbytery; this is evident from *Tertullian's* next words, *Præſident probati quique ſeniores* that is, the Biſhop and Preſbytery preſideth, or rule the Congregation) *honorem iſtum non pretio, ſed teſtimonio adepti.* This is what might be proved by hundred Arguments: but it is needleſs, ſeing it will not be denied by any perſon, who is in the leaſt acquainted with the Hiſtory of the ancient Church. And hence it will follow, that there was a Biſhop and Preſbytery in every Chriſtian Congregation in thoſe days. And conſequently, no Biſhop then had more Preſbyteries than one in his Dioceſs: *Corne-*

lius of Rome, the greatest Bishop in the World, said, *Placuit contrahi Presbyterium*, there was one Presbytery only in his Diocess. But each *Scotish* Prelate had more Presbyteries than one, or several distinct Presbyteries in his Diocess; wherefore, the late *Scotish* Prelate was a Monster not known in Antiquity. The Episcopal People in *Scotland* must know then, that that kind of Episcopacy they are so fond of, is quite another thing than was the ancient Episcopacy, and if their Ministers tell them, that the late Prelates are such Bishops, as were in the Church in the 1, 2, or 3, or 4. Centuries, they tell them an untruth, and abuse their Ignorance. If any of our Episcopal People will desire *I. S.* or any other learn'd Man of their Party, to condescend upon Particulars, or to instance and name to them, some Bishops in the 2, 3, 4, 5, or 6. Centuries, that had several distinct Presbyteries in their respective Diocesses, they will quickly perceive what a *nonplus* they will be put to, and what confusion they will be put in.

3. Seing this Canon saith, *Τὸ γένος γὰρ ἑστίν*, it is evident, that it was look'd on as no small Crime in ancient times, to have any Congregation in a Diocess besides the Bishop's Congregation.

The Reverend Archbishop Usher's Original of Bishops and Metropolitans consider'd; where it is made evident, that it makes nothing for that which is now called Episcopacy.

AS to this famous Person's Original of Bishops and Metropolitans, it has little or no reference to our Controversie. True he pleads for the Divine Original of Bishops, but not of such as are reckon'd Bishops in this Generation. He says nothing in favours of such Bishops as have absolute Power, or even a Negative Voice in the Presbytery, but of such only as are meer Presidents, and have no more power than our Chancellor has in the Parliament, the Master-Speaker in the House of Commons, or a *Scottish* Moderator in the Presbytery. For,

In his *Reduction of Episcopa*: printed by D. Bernard, he proves by the words of *Paul* and *Tertullian*, and the Order of the Church of *England*, that Spiritual Jurisdiction belongs to the common Council of Presbyters, among whom the Bishop is no more than President. And page 6. has these words, ' True it is, that in our Church this kind of *Presbyterial Government* has been long disus'd, yet seeing it still professeth, that every Pastour has a Right to rule the Church, from whence the Name of *Rector* was first given to him, and to administer the Discipline of Christ, as well as to dispense the Doctrine and Sacraments; and the restraint of the Exercise of that Right, proceedeth *only* from the custom now received in the Realm, no man can doubt, but by another Law of the Land, this hinderance might be well removed.

Then this Discourse of the Archbishop labours under the same defect as *J. S.*'s Vindication, that is, he proves not, that the primitive Bishops, or these he pleads for, were by Divine Institution Pastours of more than one Congregation, and we have made it appear, they were Congregational Bishops only.

And seing it is evident, that he who is a Pastour but of one Congregation, and has no Negative Voice in the Presbytery, but is Moderator only, or meer President there, is the very same thing we call a *Presbyterian Minister*; what the Archbishop writes for the Divine Institution of Episcopacy, militates nothing against *Scottish* Presbytery, but rather makes for it. Wherefore the zealous Brother, who caus'd The Archbishop's Original of Bishops, &c. to be lately reprinted, has no skill in this Controversie, or thought to deceive the People by the ambiguous Word *Bishop*.

Let us grant all the Archbishop proves, or seems to prove, with respect to the Divine Institution of Episcopacy, still there was no more of Episcopacy in the Church during the first three Centuries, than there is now in *Scotland*. The Bishop, in those Centuries, was no other than whom we now call *Minister of the Parish*, and the *Presbytery* was the same we call the *Kirk-Session*, or *Parochial Presbytery*: And I defy any Man to prove, that the Bishop had more power in the Presbytery then, than the Minister has in the Session now; and you see Archbishop *Usher* grants, he had no more. Nothing was then done in the Church without the knowledge of the Bishop, (*Igna. to Polyc.*) and as little is done in the Parish now without the Minister.

Neither are these Presbyterians, who acknowledge, that the Churches in the 1. and 2. Century, such as the Church of *Rome*, *Corinth*, &c. were many Congregations associated for Government,

(a) much difficulted with what the Archbishop says; for they will readily grant, there were such Bishops as he pleads for, or *President Bishops*, in the second Century. But if it be inferr'd, Seing there were such Bishops in the second Century, therefore there were in the first, and such were of Divine Institution. They will Answer, That will no more follow, than it will follow, That because Water was mix'd with the Eucharistical Wine in the second Century (b) therefore this was a Divine Institution; Or, because they Administred the Lord's Supper to Infants in that Century, therefore this was done in the Apostolical Times.

There were, says the Archbishop, such President Bishops in the Apostolical Times, because the Epistles in the *Revelation* are directed to the *Angels* of the several Churches, and to take these Angels in a Collective sense, is such a manifest wresting of Scripture, that *Beza* himself could not bear with it.

But it should have been proven, That to take the word *Angel* Collectively, to wit, for the *Presbytery*, is a wresting of Scripture. *Beza's* Fancy is no Argument. But let it be granted, (will these Presbyterians say) that *Angel* in these Epistles signifieth the Moderator, or Representing the Presbytery or Church, how will it appear, that these Moderators were constant or perpetual then, and what we call President-Bishops?

This is evident, says the Archbishop, from the clear Testimonies of *Ignatius*, &c. who wrote about twelve Years after.

O 1

Let

(a) Presbyterians in the late Times were of this Opinion, such as Mr. *Rutherford*, *Gillespie*, *Durham*, the London Ministers, and generally in both Nations.

(b) Then after this we all stand up and offer Prayers, which being ended, Bread, and Wine, and Water, as was said, is brought, then the President prays with all his might, and gives Thanks; says *Justin Martyr* in his first Apologie, which was presented to the Emperor *Antoninus Pius*, toward the middle of the second Century.

Let it be granted, there were perpetual Moderators in the Church when *Ignatius* wrote, how is it evident, because there were such then or a little before, of necessity there were such before the Death of the Apostle *John* ?

O, say they, 'Tis impossible such an Alteration could have been made in the Government in such a short time, (c) without noise or opposition. This is all they have to say.

But why impossible, pray ? greater Alterations might have been made in 12 or 14 Years time. The foresaid Alterations in the Eucharist, and others also might be instanced, were made as soon, or quickly after, and with as little noise or opposition ; neither is the precise time, nor the Name of the Author of these Innovations known. If such Alterations in the Eucharist (a Point about which the Practice of all Christians was daily concern'd) were made so soon after the Apostolical Times, let any Man give solid Reasons why Annual Moderators might not be changed into perpetual Presidents about the same time, and that with as little noise or din.

T H E

(c) The Apostle *John* died Anno 101, and *Ignatius*, according to the learned Bishop *Lloyd* and *Antonius Pagi* died Anno 116,, having writ his Epistles by the way, when he was going to *Rome*, in order to be put to death.

The Bishops in Cyprian's Time
had neither Absolute Power,
nor a Negative Voice in their
Churches.

C H A P. I.

The State of Episcopacy in the Days of Cyprian, or an Account of the Power that the Bishops had then: The Difference between the Bishops in those days, and these which the Apostles left in the Churches, and the Degrees by which it may be suppos'd, the Alterations that Episcopacy suffered, were carried on,

IN the Answer to Mr. Chillingworth's Demonstration, we have proven, That the Episcopal Diocesses during the first three Centuries, were only Congregational Churches, or what we call Parishes; and it must be acknowledged, that to prove that, is to smite Modern Episcopacy under the Fifth Rib; and evident it is, that no Power above the Presbyters, or Prerogatives that can be contr'd on the Prelates, will be able to heal the Wound, if their Jurisdiction be confin'd within such nar-

narrow Limits: And it will be found, that they who plead for the absolute Power of Bishops in *Cyprian's* time, (seing they were only Congregational Bishops) plead for absolute Power, not to the Modern Prelates, but to the Presbyterian Ministers.

Wherefore we may say, that when we contend with the Prelatists about the Nature of the Power the Bishops had in *Cyprian's* time, Whether they had absolute Power then, or only a Negative Voice, or neither of them, we play at sure Game with them: For if we overcome, or make it appear there is no reason to believe the Bishops had more Power in *Cyprian's* time, than the Pastours of our Parishes have now, we obtain a total and most compleat Victory; and if they overcome, and it remain proved notwithstanding all we have to say, that the Bishops then had absolute Power, or at least a Negative Voice in the Church; Not they, but we will gain the Prize, and reap the Fruits, or all the Advantages of a Conquest.

Whether the Bishops in the *Cyprianick* Age had really such power in their Churches as the Prelatists pretend, is what we are now about to consider; and that we may go the more orderly to work, it will not be amiss to premise something anent the State of Episcopacy in those days, and the Alterations that were made with respect thereto after the departure of the Apostles, (which indeed were not great in the 2d, 3d, or 4th Centuries) and the Steps or Degrees by which it may be probably supposed such Alterations were carried on.

In the Ancient Church we meet with three kinds of Ecclesiastical Officers, Bishops, Presbyters, and Deacons; the Bishops were an Order superior to the Presbyters, and the Presbyters superior to the Deacons, and very soon after the departure of the Apostles, these three distinct Orders appeared in the Church. This is a thing so evident, that it cannot
be

be denied without manifest absurdity. But the difficulty will be to shew, what way the early Practice of the Universal Church as to this Particular, quadrates with Scripture. The Arguments which our Prelatists propose for this end, are very contemptible. The Arguments taken from the Levites and the different Orders of the Priests under the Old Testament, or from the Twelve Apostles and Seventy Disciples, and the fictitious Episcopacy of *Timothy* and *Titus*, are so very weak, (as has been demonstrated to them a hundred times) that they can satisfy none but these who are resolved to be satisfied, be the thing right or wrong. And so much has been said against the Argument from the Angels of the Churches, in the Book of the *Revelation*, as renders it wholly ineffectual.

Nevertheless, that the Practice of the Universal Church as to this Particular, (or their having three distinct Orders of Church-Officers, Bishops, Presbyters, and Deacons) so soon after the Times of the Apostles, should contradict Scripture, or Divine Institution, is a thing which appears to me to be altogether improbable. And I'm of Opinion, that there is one place of Scripture (which the Prelatists overlook, or rather which they consider ordinarily as destructive of their Cause, and which therefore they have tortured with a thousand impertinent Glosses) in which the distinct Order of Bishops and Presbyters may be rationally founded; and which consequently makes it to appear, that the Ancient Church, by considering the Bishops as an Order distinct from the Presbyters, & superior to them, did not contradict Scripture or Divine Institution, so much as manyearn'd and pious Men have imagined. This Text is 1 Tim. 5. 17. there the Apostle saith,

Let the Elders or Presbyters, that Rule well be counted worthy of double Honour, especially they who labour in Word and Doctrine. Hence it is evident, that

that in the Apostolical times, and by their Appointment, there were two Orders of Presbyters in the Church, some who not only Ruled, but were also what we call *Pastours*, and *laboured in VVord and Doctrine*; others who *Ruled*, but were not properly *Pastours*, and laboured not in Word and Doctrine as the first Order of the Presbyters did, it being their ordinary and proper Work to Rule the Church, or to act in the Affairs of Discipline. And this I say, is sufficiently evident from this Text, notwithstanding the many Tricks that have been us'd to render it obscure. And common sense may inform us, that a greater or smaller Number of both these sorts of Presbyters were set up in each particular Church or Congregation, according as it consisted of a greater or smaller Number of People; so that in some Churches there might be many Presbyters of both kinds, in some fewer, and in other lesser Churches perhaps but one Presbyter of the first Order, or one *Pastour-Presbyter*, that is, but one Presbyter, who *laboured in VVord and Doctrine*, together with some Presbyters of the second Order, whose constant and ordinary Work was not to Preach and Administer the Sacraments, (that being the Province of these who *laboured in VVord and Doctrine*) but to *Rule*, or act in the Affairs of Discipline.

And certain it is, that the *Bishops* were they who acted as *Pastours* in the Churches after the departure of the Apostles, and perform'd the Work of daily and constant Preaching, and administred the Sacraments, and were the principal Ecclesiastical Officers, and were superior to all others: And consequently they were the Persons whom the Apostles pointed at under the Designation of these who *laboured in VVord and Doctrine*, and who in his Opinion, were worthy of double Honour *especially*. And seeing they who were call'd *Presbyters* in the Ancient Church, did sit in that Court which was call'd the *Presbytery*, and acted

acted in Affairs of Discipline, or Ruled the Church together with the Bishop, but did not labour in Word and Doctrine, they were undoubtedly the Officers which the Apostle pointed at, under the Designation of the Presbyters, or *Elders that Ruled well*.

But to make this a little more evident, *to wit*, That the Bishops in the Ancient Church were these we now call the Pastours of the Parishes, and were the Persons that *laboured in Word and Doctrine*; and that these, who were call'd the Presbyters in the Ancient Church, were not properly Pastours, and laboured not in Word and Doctrine as Pastours, (tho they preached and administred Sacraments now and then, or in an Occasional way, in case of necessity, &c.) and were not reckoned Pastours even in *Cyprian's* time; to make this, I say, something more evident before we go any farther, let it be considered in the first place,

That the Bishops in *Cyprian's* time, and all his Presbyters, however numerous they might be, had but one single Congregation in Charge among them: And seing, as we shewed before, the Bishop officiated as ordinary and constant Pastour in the Congregation, preached the Word daily, and administred the Sacraments himself, (*nec de aliorum manu quam Præsidentium vel Episcoporum sumimus, viz. Eucharistiam*) the Presbyters could have little or nothing to do, but to Rule and take notice of the Conversation of the People; and tho they had a Power to preach the Word, and administer the Sacraments, they had a power to do that in an occasional way only, in case of necessity when the Bishop was absent, or the like; so that perhaps they would not have occasion generally to meddle with the Work of Preaching or dispensing the Sacraments, once in seven Years, and some of them may be never all their lifetime. Wherefore they who were called Presbyters in *Cyprian's* time, were not what we now call Pastours, or were not like

these who are called Presbyters [in this Generation, but these who are called Presbyters now, are the same who were called Bishops in *Cyprian's* time, and they who were called Presbyters in *Cyprian's* time, were the same thing that we call *Ruling Elders* now. So that the Bishop and Presbytery in *Cyprian's* time, was the very same thing that we call, the Minister and Kirk-Session in this Age.

Consider in the next place what *Cyprian* says, Ep. 69. p. 136. *A Portion of the Flock is committed to every Pastour, which he is to Rule and Govern, being to give account of his Administrations to the LORD. By Pastours* here he understands Bishops, as is evident from what he adds immediately after: *VVherefore, saith he, these over whom we are set, should not run to and fro, and set at Variance the harmonious Concord of the Bishops by their fraudulent and deceitful Temerity* *. Seing by Pastours here, *Cyprian* understands Bishops, and seing he affirms, that a convenient Part or Portion of the Flock, that is, the Church Universal is committed to every Bishop as Pastour, it is evident, he thought, that no Portion of the Universal Church was committed to any Presbyter as Pastour, and consequently, that no Presbyter then had a Congregation of his own distinct from that of the Bishop, in which he acted as Pastour in ordinary, feeding it by the preaching of the Word and Administration of the Sacraments. Certain it is, that a particular Congregation is a Portion of the Flock, and that a Presbyter who is intrusted with the Charge of a particular Congregation, has a Portion of the Flock committed to him as particular Pastour thereof. And I say, that no Presbyter had a Congregation in the 3d. Century, committed to him as particular Pastour of it; for if it was so, it will follow from thir words

* Et singulis Pastoribus portio Gregis sit adscripta, quam regat unusquisque & gubernet, rationem sui actus Domino redditurus, oportet utique eos quibus præsumus non Circumcurfare, nec Episcoporum Concordiam coherentem sua subdola & fallaci temeritate collidere.

words of *Cyprian*, that Presbyters not only preached and administred the Sacraments in their particular Congregations, but had a Government in them distinct from that of the Bishop, and as independent on him, as his Government was on the Synod, *Quam regat & gubernet unusquisque rationem sui actus Domino redditurus*: And consequently, that every Presbyter had a particular Presbytery in his particular Congregation, which is notoriously false, because there was no Government then but where there was a Bishop, and no Presbytery but the Bishop's Presbytery, in which he personally presided.

And if *Cyprian* look'd on Presbyters as Pastours, the Definition he gives us of a Church, in his Ep. 66, to wit, *Plebs sacerdoti adunata, & Pastori suo Grex adhaerens*, that is, A People united to their Priest, and a Flock adhering to their Pastour, is notoriously senseless; for if Presbyters had Congregations committed to them in *Cyprian's* time, would not the particular Congregation of each Presbyter have been a People united to their Priest, or a Flock adhering to their Pastour, as well as the Bishop's Church.

In like manner in Ep. 41. he calls *Felicissimus's* setting up a separate Congregation, *To divide a Portion of the People with the Bishop, and to separate the Sheep from the Pastour*, not from the Pastours, but from the Pastour the Bishop, wherefore he look'd on the Bishop as sole Pastour, and did not reckon the Presbyters Pastours at all. If it be said, He takes no notice of the Presbyters here, and calls them not Pastours, because they were only Inferior Pastours, and subordinate to the Bishop. Why may it not be as well said, That he should not have call'd the Bishop a Pastour either, seing he was as much subordinate to the Synod and more too, than the Presbyters were to him? And therefore should not have call'd *Felicissimus* setting up that separate Congregation, a parting of the Sheep from the Pastour, but

a parting of the Sheep from the Synod. If the Hypothesis of our Adversaries be good, *Cyprian* would not only have said, That *Felicissimus* did separate the Sheep from the Bishop, but that he did break in upon the particular Sheepfolds, and separate the Sheep not only from himself, but from their immediate Pastours, and he would not have fail'd to insist upon this and to aggravate it, seing according to the Supposition we are speaking of, these People communicated with the Bishop, only by communicating with these subordinate Pastours, and if they were join'd to *Cyprian* the Bishop, these Pastours were the Glue by which they were join'd to him.

What needs more, the thing is as evident as can be desir'd, from what the Presbyters in *Rome* say to the Presbyters in *Carthage*, (*Ep. inter Cypr. 8.*) in a word they deny themselves to be Pastours. The Chair of *Rome* was then vacant by the death of Bishop *Fabianus*, and the Chair of *Carthage* was in a manner vacant too, by reason of *Cyprian's* Retirement, in the mean time the Presbytery of *Rome* writ to that of *Carthage*, and exprest themselves thus, *Et cum incumbat nobis qui Videmur esse Præpositi, & Vice Pastoris custodire Gregem*, that is, *We who seem to be Bishops, and watch the Flock in stead of the Pastour*. They were not Pastours then more than they were Bishops, they were only persons who kept the Flock and watched it in the absence of the Pastour, when there was not a Bishop among them they seem'd to be Pastours, but when they had a Bishop among them, they neither were Pastours nor seem'd so to be. In a word, they were no more look'd on as Pastours, than the Deacons were look'd on as such, that is plainly, they were not look'd on as Pastours at all. And *I. S.* will inform you, that the Title of ποιμήν or Pastour, is that which *Eusebius* gives ordinarily to the Bishops, which he would not have done if the Presbyters had been Pastours

in a proper sense as well as they. Seing then the Bishops were the Pastours of the Congregations or Churches, and laboured in Word and Doctrine, they, I say, were certainly the Presbyters which the Apostle reckoned worthy of double Honour *especially*. And seing the Presbyters in the Ancient Church were not Pastours such as *laboured* in Word and Doctrine, their ordinary and more proper Work being *to Rule* or act in Affairs of Discipline, they were the Officers which the Apostle points out by these words, *Let the Presbyters that Rule*, &c. But that we may explain this Point something more particularly, and shew in the mean time, what Alterations were made in the Government of the Church, between the Apostolick and *Cyprianick* Times, I say,

1. There was a real Difference between Bishops and Presbyters, or if you please, Bishops were Officers superior to the Presbyters in the time of the Apostles, and by their appointment, tho they had but one Name then, or were call'd Bishops or Presbyters indifferently, and had but one kind of Ordination.

2. There were in the Apostolical times many Bishops and Presbyters, or several Presbyters both of the First and Second Order in many or most particular Churches, and very probably but one Presbyter of the first Order or Pastour-Presbyter, together with some Presbyters of the second Order, in the maller or lesser Populous Churches. If it had been as much contrary to the Apostolical Practice as it was to the practice of the Church in the *Cyprianick* Age, to set up more Bishops than one in a particular Congregation or Church, Paul would not have said, *Let the Presbyters that Rule well be counted worthy of double Honour, especially they who labour in Word and Doctrine*, but would have said, *Especially he that laboureth in Word and Doctrine*. And this is very

very agreeable to the Constitution of our Church, for tho we have but one Bishop or Pastour, or Presbyter of the first Order, in most of our Congregations or Parishes, yet we have two Bishops in many of them, and would be content to have 3 or 4 in some more numerous Congregations, if that could be conveniently done. But how they came to dream in *Cyprian's* time, that there could be but one Bishop in a Church at one time, or that to set up two Bishops together would be to make two Churches, it is not easy to guess. It is even as much contrary to Divine Institution, or to the Nature of the Thing, to have two or three Bishops in a Church at a time, as it is contrary to the Nature of a City to have two or three Physicians in it together. And *Cyprian* might have said with as much Reason, That there being two Consuls in *Rome* made two Commonwealths, or there being two Kings in *Lacedemon*, made that City two Nations or Kingdoms.

3. The Name *Bishop*, might begin to be appropriated to the Presbyters of the first Order, soon after the Apostolical times, when as yet there were many, or more than one Pastour-Presbyter in many particular Churches. And I reckon, that the Confusion in the Order of the Succession of the first Bishops of *Rome* might arise from hence; and more than probable it is, whatever some Great and Learned Men may say who write to serve an Hypothesis, that *Clemens*, *Linus*, *Cletus*, and *Anacletus*, were Bishops of *Rome* not successively, but at one and the same time.

4. It is very probable, that the Name *Bishop* did first begin to be appropriated to the Presbyters of the first Order, or Pastour-Presbyters, in these less populous Churches, in which there was but one Presbyter of the first Order placed by the Apostles.

5. When an Apostle, or some extraordinary Officer (*Ex. gr.* *Timothy* or *Titus*) did reside in a Church for a time, as *Paul* did at *Corinth* one and twenty Months.

Months, no doubt all the other Pastours in that Church gave place to him, and he was the person that preached alwise when the Church Assembled, and in this he resembl'd him who was afterwards called *Bishop*; (and this was the Reason that many of the Fathers call'd the Apostles or Evangelists Bishops of these Churches in which they remained a considerable time, and died, as *Mark Bishop of Alexandria, Paul and Peter Bishops of Rome*) And when the Apostles and other extraordinary Officers were remov'd, it is very probable that all the Presbyters of the first Order, or Pastour-Presbyters in a Church, might give place to him who had the most edifying or shining Gifts among 'em, or was most affected by the People (or in other Churches where there was no great disparity among the Pastours with respect to Qualifications, perhaps he who was the eldest or first ordain'd Presbyter might be pitch'd on) partly being accusom'd to such a Practice, when an Apostle or some extraordinary Person was among them, partly being induc'd hereto by the Contrivances and Intrigues of some foreward and ambitious Men of the temper of *Diotrephes*; and they might be the more easily brought to this, to wit, to the setting up of one of the Presbyters of the first Order as sole Pastour, by the Example of these other Churches in which the Apostles set up but one Pastour-Presbyter. However, to this we may refer *Jerom's Toto Orbe decretum est.*

By this means now, whereas before there were many Presbyters of the first Order, or Pastour-Presbyters in many or most particular Churches, one of them became Constant or sole Pastour, and preached ordinarily, or always when the Church did assemble; and he was very soon distinguished from the rest of his Colleagues, or the rest of the Presbyters of the first Order, by getting the Name *Bishop* appropriated to himself. And thus all the Presbyters

of

Bishops and thir Presbyters of the first Order must *ferom* be understood as speaking, when he says, *In quo manifestissime comprobatur eundem esse Episcopum atque Presbyterum*, and the Difference between the Bishop and them, must be attributed either to Humane Appointment, or Custom which prevailed gradually and insensibly among the Churches. *Magis consuetudine quam dispositionis Dominicæ veritate* †.

6. I look on't as certain, that in these Churches in which the Apostles set up but one Presbyter of the first Order, together with some of the second Rank, that Presbyter, as he did alwise preach and act as Pastour, so he did preside in all the Meetings about Affairs of Discipline, or in the Presbytery, that is, was constant Moderator. But in these Churches in which the Apostles set up many Presbyters both of the first and second Order, whether they of the first Order presided in the Presbytery, as they preached in the Congregation, that is, *per vices*, or time about, or whether he who was the most expert among them, or he that was first Ordain'd presided alwise in the Presbytery, or acted as constant Moderator, is something uncertain, upon account of defect of Records in these more early Times of the Church, tho I think it more probable, that they acted as Moderators *per vices* or Tour about in the Presbytery. But when the Alteration we are speaking of was made, that is, when one of the Presbyters of the first Order was made sole Pastour and call'd Bishop, it is not to be doubted that he became perpetual Moderator at the same time: And as little is it to be questioned, that before this Alteration was made, the Apostles, or other extraordinary Officers, acted as

Q

con

† Take notice here of the absurdness of these who pretend, that according to *Jerom*, this Alteration we are speaking of, was made by the Apostles themselves, and that when the Schism fell out at *Corinth*. If that is true, *Jerom* could not have said, *Magis consuetudine quam dispositionis Dominicæ veritate*. See Mr. *Ting's* learn'd and excellent Defence of Mr. *M. H.'s* brief Enquiry into the Nature of Schism, p. 28, 29.

constant Moderators in the Churches in which they did reside at the time. And if two or three Apostles were together in one place or Church for some time, it is rational to think, they would preside in the Presbytery, or act as Moderator time about.

7. When one of the Presbyters of the first Order was thus set up as constant Pastour in each particular Church or Congregation, and became perpetual Moderator, and got the Name *Bishop* appropriated to himself, and this Practice was something rooted in the Church by custom and use, these new Bishops began to think of increasing their Authority: and particularly they either got or did arrogate to themselves a peculiar Interest in *Ordinations*, so that the Presbytery was not allow'd to ordain their Bishop, as they did their Pastour-Presbyters or Bishops formerly, but, that the Authority and splendour of the Priesthood might be maintain'd, some of the Neighbouring Bishops did Conveen to lay on Hands when a Bishop was to be Ordain'd. Yet this Innovation did not prevail equally in all places; for the Presbytery of *Alexandria* did maintain their Rights for a considerable time, so that they ordain'd their own Bishops until the times of *Heraclius* and *Dionysius*. Moreover, that the Presbytery should do nothing of consequence without the Bishop, or in his absence, tho when he was present in the Presbytery he had no Negative Voice, was another Privilege they got added to the former; but when, and by what means they obtain'd it, or what Opposition they met with in establishing it, is what cannot be known, by reason of the defectiveness of Ecclesiastical Records. However in this state was Episcopacy in *Cyprian's* time.

In *Cyprian's* time then there was one Pastour, (who was call'd the Bishop) in every Diocess, particular Congregation, or Church; together with some Presbyters more or fewer, according as the Congre-

gregation was more or less numerous, who might be call'd Ruling-Elders, in regard that the Bishop being the Pastour of the Congregation, their Work should principally lie in Ruling or Acting in the Affairs of Discipline. In this then the Constitution of the Church of *Scotland* agrees with that in the days of *Cyprian*, that they have a Pastour, Bishop, or Minister, together with a competent number of Presbyters, or Ruling-Elders, and Deacons, in each particular Church or Congregation; and cometh nearer to the Apostolical Pattern in this, that it admitteth of two or more Bishops, where a Congregation is large and numerous; whereas the Churches in *Cyprian's* time were so ignorant or superstitious, that they thought it unlawful to have more Bishops than one in a Congregation at a time, tho that was no wise contrary to the Nature of the Thing, or to Scripture, or any Divine Appointment.

On the other hand, the Constitution of this Church differs from that in the 3d. Age, that the Ruling-Elders have no power either to preach or administer Sacraments; whereas the *Cyprianick* Ruling-Elders or Presbyters could, as was said, do both these Occasionally in case of Necessity, or when the Bishop was absent, &c. But whether the *Cyprianick* or *Scotish* Church comes nearest the Apostolical Pattern with respect to this Particular, is what lies not in our way to determine. The Learned who have written upon this Subject may be consulted. My Work is to make it appear, that the *Scotish* Presbyterian Ministers are such Diocesan Bishops as *Cyprian* or his Cotemporaries were, and consequently that the Presbyterian Government of this Church is really Episcopal Government, as the Government of the Church was Episcopal in *Cyprian's* time, and that is a thing that depends not upon the Ruling-Elders, their having or wanting a Power to preach the Gospel now and then, or in an Occasional way.

Indeed if it be made appear, that the Presbyters before and in *Cyprian's* time, were fix'd in distinct Congregations, and acted in them as constant Pastours, (as these do who are call'd Presbyters in this Age) and that these Congregations were parts of the Episcopal Church or Diocese, and were under his Episcopal Jurisdiction, I must confess, that will alter the Case, and I shall acknowledge, that the *Cyprianick* Bishops were nearer a-kin to the Modern Diocesan Prelates, than to the *Scotish* Presbyterian Bishops: For, to have the Episcopal Oversight of many or more Congregations than one, which have particular Pastours of their own fix'd in them, is essential to what we now call a Diocesan Prelate, and if his Episcopal Oversight be confin'd to one Congregation, he is destroy'd, that is, is no more what is now call'd a Diocesan Bishop, but what we call a Minister or Pastour of a Paroch in *Scotland*: And however many Elders (or Presbyters, call them what you will) he may have belonging to his Congregation, tho as many as *Cornelius* Bishop of *Rome* had, or whether these Presbyters have a Power to preach and administer Sacraments in case of Necessity, or not, the Case will be the same. If all the Ruling Elders in the Church of *Scotland*, were impow'ered to preach and administer Sacraments in case of necessity, that would not make the Ministers or Pastours more properly Diocesan Bishops than they really are already *. Wherefore, whether that Power to preach and administer Sacraments in case of necessity, which the *Cyprianick* Ruling-Elders had, was agreeable to the Original Institution of these Officers, or a thing contrary thereto, is what our Controversie does not depend upon; and to enquire farther

* A very worthy Minister of this Church, who is yet living, had a Son who was a licens'd Preacher of the Gospel, and was also Ordain'd an Elder or Presbyter of his Congregation, and he did actually sit in the General Assembly as an Elder; yet no man ever dream'd, that that Minister was a Bishop in a more proper sense than his Neighbours, on that account.

ther about it, will not be to our purpose. Only I think I may say two Things here.

In the *First* place, it is no wise an absurd thing to suppose, that the Churches in or before *Cyprian's* time might grant to the Ruling-Elders a Power to preach and administer Sacraments in case of necessity, tho they had no such Power by their Original Institution; and that for these Reasons, 1. It is very certain, that the Churches in or before *Cyprian's* time granted such a Power to the Deacons contrary to the Nature of the Institution of that Office, they granted them a Power to preach, and a Power to administer the Sacrament of Baptism at least, as *Tertullian* doth witness. And why may it not be suppos'd that they granted this Power to the Presbyters, tho they had it not by vertue of the Primitive Institution of their Offices. Nay, their granting this Privilege to the Deacons necessitated them to grant it to the Presbyters also, for otherwise they had made the Office of the Deacons superior to that of the Presbyters or Ruling-Elders, which by Divine Institution was inferior thereto. 2. To grant such a Power to the Presbyters, tho it did not belong to them by the Original Institution of their Office, would be look'd on as a small Matter then, when even Lay-men were sometimes imploy'd by the Bishops in the Work of Preaching. "*Origen* retir'd into *Palestine* (says *Du Pin*) and being come to settle in the City of *Casarea*, the Bishops of that Province desir'd him to expound publickly the Scripture in that Church, and to instruct the People in their presence; tho he was not yet a Presbyter: To which Request of theirs he complied. Now whether *Demetrius* (who was Bishop of *Alexandria*, to which Church *Origen* did belong) envied him this Honour, or whether he was perswaded that they had violated the Rules of the Church, he wrote to these Prelates, telling them,

" That

" That it was a thing unheard of, and that it had
 " never been practis'd till then, that Lay-men
 " should preach in the presence of Bishops. But
 " *Alexander of Jerusalem*, and *Theodotus of Casarea*,
 " writing back to him, proved by several Instances,
 " that this had been often put in practice. In the
 Life of *Origen*. And says *Hilary* in his Comment.
 on Ch. 4. Epistle to the *Ephesians*, *Ut ergo cresceret*
Plebs & multiplicaretur, omnibus inter initia concessum
est & evangelizare, & baptizare, & scripturas in Ecclesia
explanare. It would be an easy thing at first then to
 the Elders or Presbyters to get this Privilege we
 are speaking of into their hands, and when once it
 became Customary that they should be employ'd in
 that Work, it would not be difficult to them to keep
 possession, seeing they were Church-Officers, and
 the principal Church-Officers too next to the Bi-
 shops. Then it contributed mightily to the Ease
 of the Bishop, that the Presbyters should remain in
 possession of this Privilege, because they would not
 be tied to such punctual Attendance on their Churches,
 seeing the Presbyters might officiate for them in
 their absence. Moreover, in *Cyprian's* time when
 an Episcopal Chair was Vacant, one us'd alwise to
 be chosen out of the Number of the Presbyters to
 fill that Post, wherefore they might allow them
 such a Power to preach as we are speaking of, in
 order to qualify them for the Episcopal Function, tho
 no such power belong'd to the Nature of their Office.
 Further, *Tertullian* informs us, that in this time there
 were some in the Church who were only concern'd in
 the Affairs of Discipline, and had nothing to do with
 preaching the Word, or dispensing the Sacraments,
Quod si Disciplinæ solius officia sortitus es, Lib. de Pudic.
c. 21. And whether it may be inferred hence, that
 in his time some of the Presbyters had not the power
 either of preaching or administering Sacraments, I
 leave to the Judicious to consider.

Secondly, If the Assembly of this Church should allow to all the Ruling-Elders that are Qualified, and have Inclinations to the Work, such a Power to preach and administer Sacraments as the *Cyprianick* Ruling-Elders had, in my Opinion, the Alteration which thereby would be made in the Constitution of this Church, would be very small and inconsiderable †.

But to return to our Purpose; Seing the *Cyprianick* Bishops had no more power but that we have mention'd, it is evident, they were only such Bishops as the Presbyterian Bishops in *Scotland* are at this day. 1. The Presbyterian Ministers are Pastours of Congregations as well as the *Cyprianick* Bishops were. 2. As to Ordination, they have the power hereof as much and more than the Bishops either in the days of *Cyprian* or a hundred Years after had. In *Cyprian's* time, the Bishops alone laid on hands at the Ordination of a Bishop; in like manner now, when a Minister is Ordain'd, none but Ministers lay on hands, the Presbytery of the place is intirely excluded from that Work. And whereas, the Elders or Presbyters in *Cyprian's* time and after, did lay on hands together with the Bishop in the Ordination of Presbyters, our Presbyterian Ministers will not at all allow their Presbyters, or Elders and Deacons to be ordain'd by

† Perhaps *I. S.* will laugh at such a Saying, and tell us of the Cöbler of *Curry*, and Weaver at the *West-Kirk*; But let him say what he will, there are many Ruling-Elders better qualified for Preaching, than many Bishops were in the days of *Cyprian*: And there are abundance belonging to that Order in this Church both Gentlemen and Trades-men, who if they were allow'd to go about the Work of Prayer, could acquit themselves to such excellent Purpose, that they would deserve to be admired, and would make very evident, that they stood in no need of a Set-Form. Here I must commend 3 Canons of the Council of *Carthage*, Anno 398, to the Consideration of these who think it a mighty Scandal, that Trades-men should be made Elders of the Church, importing, that they who belong to the inferior Clergy shall earn their Living by an honest Trade, how able soever they may be; The 51 Can. of that Coun. is, *Clericus, quantumlibet verba dei eruditus, artificis vitium quaerat.* The 52 Can. is, *Clericus vitium & vestimentum sibi artificioso vel agricultura, absque officii sui detrimento, parat.* And the 53 Can. is, *Omnes Clerici qui ad operandum validiores sunt, & artificiosa & terras discant.* Wherefore, the Fathers of that Council would not have been rash, as to make a Jest of the Cöbler at *Curry*, or Weaver at the *West-Kirk*.

by imposition of hands, reserving this kind of Ordination as an Honour peculiar to themselves, in this respect therefore, the power of the Presbyterian Bishops is greater than was the power of the Bishops, in the 3d, 4th, or even the 5th Century. And 3. If the Presbytery in *Cyprian's* time could not, or at least would not do any thing of considerable Moment in the Affairs of the Church without the Bishop, as little can the Parochial Presbytery in *Scotland* now do without the Minister or Bishop.

If then the *Cyprianick* Bishops had such power only as we have specified, they did not differ from the Presbyterian Ministers in this Generation. Wherefore our Prelatists find themselves obliged to affirm, that the then Bishops had much more power, and some of them scruple not to tell us confidently, That the Bishops in that Age had *Absolute Power*, others of them, that they had at least a *Negative Voice* in the Church. We say, they neither had absolute Power, nor a Negative Voice in the Church in those days.

C H A P. II.

That the Bishop had not Absolute Power in the Church.

THEY who set up for the Bishop's Absolute Power, as they are few, so they are extravagant and I cannot tell if it be worth the while to notice them. Certainly nothing can be advanced more contrary to Scripture than such a Pretence *The Kings of the Gentiles*, saith our Saviour, Luk 22. 25, 26. *exercise Lordship over them, and they that exercise Authority upon them, are call'd Benefactors.*

but ye shall not be so, but he that is greatest among you let him be as the younger, and he that is chief, as he that doth serve. They ordinarily tell us, that our Saviour doth not here discharge Superiority among Church Officers. Be it so. But sure I am, if he does not discharge whether Apostles * or other Ministers to exercise Absolute Power over the Church, he discharges nothing at all. Will it be said, That to exercise Absolute power, is not to exercise Dominion and Lordship, or Authority over Persons? That is ridiculous, seing to exercise Absolute Power, is to exercise Lordship or Dominion in the highest Degree. Who will deny, that the King of *britain* exerciseth Dominion and Lordship in these Isles, or Authority over us, tho he has no Absolute Power at all? Will it be said, He only dischargeth the exercising Dominion and Lordship, or Authority in an Imperious and Tyrannical way? But it is Dominion and Lordship it self that he dischargeth, and not the way and manner of it: He says not, Ye shall not exercise Dominion and Lordship in an imperious and tyrannical Way, but ye shall not exercise Dominion. Or will it be said, That when he dischargeth the exercising of Dominion or Lordship, *Matth.* 20. 25. he proposeth his own Example, but he himself had Absolute Power, therefore he doth not discharge his Ministers to exercise Absolute Power? But seing it is evident from what has been said, That our Saviour does indeed discharge the Exercise of Absolute Power in this place, if it be said, That he allows his Ministers in the very next Sentence to exercise Absolute Power, on pretence, that he proposes the Example of himself who had all Power, he will be made to speak Contradictions. Wherefore

R

it

* Seing our Saviour did discharge the Apostles to take upon them Absolute Power in the Church, I think they may be reckoned very shameless Men who attribute such Power to Bishops. *Quantus arrogantiae tumor est, quanta humilitatis & lenitatis oblitio, arrogantia suae quanta jactatio, ut quis aut audent, aut facere se posse credat, quod nec Apostoli concessit Dominus.* Cyprian. Ep, 55. p. 12.

it must not be said, That he proposes his own Example here in the full latitude thereof, (as he had all Power in Heaven and Earth, the Keys of Hell and of Death, the Key of *David* that openeth and no man shutteth, and shutteth, and no man openeth, &c.) but that he proposes his own Example in his present Circumstances, that is, as he was in the Form of a Servant, and came not to be ministred unto, but to Minister, or he propos'd his own Example with particular Regard to the present Action of washing his Disciples Feet.

To the same purpose *Peter*, *Neither as being Lords over GOD's Heritage, but being Ensamples to the Flock.* Will any rational Man say, That they who claim an Absolute Power over GOD's People, do not claim Lordship over them? Is not the Queen our Sovereign Lady, tho she has no Absolute Power over us?

Then our Saviour not only dischargeth Dominion and Absolute Power in the Church, but all Names or Titles that might be thought any way to import such Power, as *Rabbi, Master, Doctor*, or the like: *Mat. 23.* And he discharges the Apostles themselves to assume such Titles, much more Bishops or other ordinary Officers. And on the contrary, such Names or Titles are given to them in Scripture as have no Affinity with Sovereignty, and imply quite another thing than Absolute Power, or their having Authority over the Church as Lords and Princes. Thus they are call'd *Ministers or Servants*, *Col. 1. 17. 1 Cor. 3. 5. 2 Cor. 4. 5. &c.* And *1 Tim. 1. 12.* Paul thanks Christ, not for making him a Sovereign Lord, or giving him Absolute Power, but for putting him into the Ministry. They are call'd *Ambassadors, Messengers, Stewards, Labourers, &c.* And what probability is there, that Christ would have given them such Titles, and absolutely discharged any that might be Constructed to import Lordship or Dominion,

nion, if he had intended they should be Monarchs in the Church, and invested with an Absolute Power.

Moreover this Opinion, That Bishops should have Absolute Power, is not only contrary to Scripture, but to common sense nay is impious. For they who say, That Bishops should have Absolute Power, say, that we should give them Absolute Obedience, but Absolute Obedience is a kind of Adoration, and that because we are not capable to give a higher kind of Obedience to GOD, nay a higher kind cannot be imagined; to give Absolute Obedience is to go to the very outmost Point; it is a boundless and unlimited Submission, and in a manner infinite. They who love any Creature as much as they can love GOD, or with the highest Degree of Love, make that Creature equal with GOD, or esteem it as much as Him, and consequently by so doing, become guilty of Idolatry: And to give the Bishops Absolute Obedience, is to give them the highest kind of Obedience, and to honour them as much as God Almighty, and to make them equal to him in that respect; And consequently, if Bishops claim Absolute Power, they are guilty of downright Rebellion against GOD; and if Presbyters and People yield Absolute Obedience to them, they do thereby become guilty of manifest Idolatry.

This then is a wicked Opinion, and in a Word, I know not what could have been invented more destructive to Christianity, or pernicious to the Church, GOD has no where obliged himself by Promise, to guide the Bishops by a Spirit of Infallibility, nay nor to keep them in a state of Grace; wherefore they may make Defection, and become Enemies to Jesus Christ. Every body knows what sort of Men the Bishops were before the Reformation, and what has been may be; and if such Persons have an Absolute Power, it is easy to conjecture what a Pass the Flock will be brought to in a very

short time. No Man who understands any thing either of Religion or common sense, can think, that *Jesus Christ* has so little regard to these whom he has purchased with his Blood, and to whom he saith by his Apostle, *Be not ye the Servants of Men*, as to throw them away, that they may be subservient to the Lusts or secular Interest of a Set of Men, to whom he will for ought we know, say one day, *Verily I never knew you*. It is a certain thing, that Christ has made the Bishops for the Church, and not the Church for the Bishops, wherefore if they make Defection, and become so far from being serviceable to the Ends for which he appointed them, that they discourage Religion, and endeavour to draw away People from the ways of GOD, and simplicity of the Gospel; there is no doubt, but the Church has a Power to throw them out as *Salt that has lost his savour*, and to substitute others in their place: Wherefore it can never be supposed that they have Absolute Power, and the Church has no Right to call them to an Account for their Actions.

Neither do the Fathers countenance this Opinion †, none of them affirm, that the Bishops either had or should have such a Power. Particularly as to *Cyprian*, it would be easy to make it appear, by innumerable Passages in his Epistles, that he never pretended to any such thing. Take but one Example in Epist. 34. Where he declares, that he could not
alone

† Εἰς διδασκαλίαν λόγου προεχειρίσθημεν, ἔκ εἰς ἀρχὴν ὁδε εἰς αὐθεντίαν συμβαλὼντάξιν ἐπέχομεν παραινούντων &c. *Chryso. in Eph. Orat. 11. i. e.* We were designed to Teach the Word, and not to exercise Dominion, or Sovereignty; we do bear the Rank of Advisers exhorting to Duty. *Sed contenti sint bonore suo, Patres se sciant esse non Dominos.* Hieron. *adversus Joann. Hier. s. l. ad Theoph.* Illud etiam dico, quod Episcopi Sacerdotes se esse noverint non Dominos, idem *ad Nepoti.* Christ is theirs who are humble, and not who exalt themselves over his Flock; *Clemens to the Cor.* If to claim Absolute Power be not to exalt our selves over the Flock, what doth to exalt our selves over it imply? *Ne quis putaret in solis Apostolis, aut Episcopis, spem esse ponendam, sic ait, Quid est enim Paulus vel quia Apollo? Utique Ministri ejus in quem credidistis, est ergo in vniuersis seruientibus, non Dominium sed Ministerium.* Optat. Lib. 5.

alone determine in the Affair of *Philumenus* and the rest, *Cui rei* (says he) *non potui me solum Judicem* are--- *Cum hæc singulorum tractanda sit & limanda lenius ratio non tantum cum collegis, &c. I. S.* will tell us this was voluntary Condescension. But whether shall we believe him or *Cyprian* himself, who declareth expressly, *Non potui*, that he could not do otherwise?

It being thus very evident, that this Opinion is groundless and unreasonable, it is deserted by most and the most learned of the Prelatical Writers themselves; yet many of them pretend, that the Bishops should have a *Negative Voice*, and actually had such a Voice in *Cyprian's* time, and long before even in the days of *Ignatius*.

C H A P. III.

That the Bishop had not a Negative Voice in the second and third Centuries.

A Negative Voice is doubtless a considerable Privilege, a very high Prerogative in the Church, exalts a Man as a Prince above his fellows, and gives as much Power to one person, as to the whole Community, and consequently is a matter of the greatest importance in the Government: Wherefore if any persons pretend to such a Privilege, they must produce their Commission, and make good their Title by very clear and undeniable evidence. We have all the Reason in the World then to inquire, How is it evident, that the Bishop should have such a Prerogative? Where doth his Commission ly?

To pretend to prove this by ambiguous Expressions to be met with in *Cyprian's* Epistles, or here and there in the Writings of the Ancients, or by obsolete Phrases, the true import of which is perhaps forgotten some hundreds of Years ago, is but a Jest. What would be said to a Man who should think to prove, That the President has a Negative Voice in the Session, because he has a more plentiful Salary, the Door, has a Chair erected in the middle, and the rest of the Lords sit in a Semicircle about him; or because in some ancient Records or Histories, there is mention perhaps made of the President's *Place* and *Degree* in the Session, he is said to be exalted to the *Sublime fastigium*, or highest Rank amongst the Senators of the College of Justice; or because *Power* is attributed to him, or *Honour*, *Authority*, *Dignity*, *Vigor*, or *Providence*, or the like? Nothing but an express and positive Act of Parliament will be able to found his Right to such a Privilege, or bear the weight of so great a Prerogative.

We reckon then, that nothing below Scripture Authority can be sufficient to found a Right to such a Privilege; and if the Bishops be destitute thereof will look on their Pretences as vain: And who can quarrel us for rejecting their Pretences to this Privilege, as groundless and unreasonable, if they cannot produce one Text of Scripture from which it may be clearly proven, or so much as probably inferred, that such a Privilege is their due? If the Council in *Scotland* should receive one as Commissioner or Viceroy, who could produce no Commission from the King, or Warrant under his hand for the effect, would they not Forfeit their own Commissions, and be looked on as guilty of breaking their Allegiance to his Majesty? Or who would blame the People, if they should refuse to own such a Pretence to be Viceroy, and deny Obedience to him? then the Bishops can produce no Commission from
Jest

Jesus Christ, no Passage of Scripture bearing that they should have a Negative Voice in the Church, no person can blame our refusing them this Privilege, or our rejecting their Pretences thereto.

Tho' the greater part of the Fathers in the first 5. or 6. Centuries, of whose Writings we have any knowledge, should positively declare, That the Bishops should have a Negative Voice in the Church, and that the Apostles themselves appointed this by Orders from Jesus Christ; this would be no sufficient warrant to us, it being acknowledged on all hands, that the Fathers were not infallible, and certainly known that actually they did err in several considerable Points. Indeed if we had no Scripture, none of the Writings of the Apostles themselves to consult, the Testimony of the Fathers might perhaps be thought something considerable as to this Particular. But seeing we have the Scriptures among our hands to consult and look to with our own Eyes, and seeing the Fathers themselves own these Scriptures to be perfect, and to contain all things necessary, and positively declare, That no regard is to be had to what they say in their own Writings, but in so far as they prove it by these Divine Scriptures; if we find that the Scriptures are wholly silent as to this Prerogative of the Bishops, the truth is, I see not what stress could be laid on the Testimony of the Fathers, with respect thereto, even tho it should be found to be unanimous, and very clear and positive. However, if the Fathers say no such thing in any of their Writings, if our Prelatical Brethren cannot produce so much as one Father of the first 5 or 6 Centuries, positively affirming, that Christ or his Apostles appointed the Bishops to have a Negative Voice in the Church, or expressly declaring, That they actually had this Prerogative in their time, whoever they might be indebted to for it: With what con-

tempt and disdain, think you, should Pretences to such a Prerogative be rejected by us?

In fine, if they could shew us Canons of some ancient Councils appointing the Bishops to have this Prerogative, or allowing them a Negative Voice in the Church, this would amount to no more but humane Right, and might justly be rejected among other Innovations. But if we can defy them to produce one Canon of any ancient Council, whether Universal or Particular, expressly appointing them to have such a Voice, nor so much as clearly supposing, that they had it actually in the Church, we will have great reason to conclude, that such a Pretence as this is one of the most unjust and groundless that can be imagined.

We say then, that this Privilege is imaginary and altogether groundless, it has no Foundation at all either in Scripture or Antiquity: There is no Text of Scripture from which it may be evidently concluded, or so much as probably inferred, that Bishops should have this Prerogative; no ancient Father affirms it either directly or indirectly; no Canon of any ancient Council, either gives them, or supposes them to have such a Prerogative.

First then, there is no word in Scripture of such a Privilege belonging to any one person in the Church, Presbyter or Bishop. There is no word in Scripture of the Prerogatives the Bishop of Rome claims to, whether of being universal Bishop, supreme and infallible Judge of Controversies, Head of the Church, or the like; and all Protestants, and even the Prelatists themselves, think this a sufficient Argument to prove, that the Pope has no Right to such Privileges, and is a Tyrant and Usurper in pretending to them. And seeing there is no more Ground in Scripture for the Bishop's Negative Voice than for the Pope's universal Supremacy, or Infallibility, &c. why should we not condemn and reject them?

them both, why should we not look upon the silence of Scripture as as strong an Argument against the Bishop as it is against the Pope? why should we not look on these Bishops as Tyrants and Usurpers for pretending to unscriptural Prerogatives, as well as we look on the Pope as such for the very same Reason?

Promulgation is necessary to the establishing of a Law, or in order to the requiring of Obedience thereto. If the King and Parliament make a Law, and intend, that the People give Obedience to it, they will publish that Law to the Nation, and set it down in Record among their other Acts; and if this be not done, no Person will be blam'd for breaking such a Law. Wherefore if Jesus Christ had intended, that the Bishop should be an Ecclesiastical Monarch, or have a Negative in the Church, would he not have made known his Pleasure herein? would he not have caused this Law to be promulgated, or set down in Record in Scripture, which is the Register of all the Acts of Heaven? Would he not have furnished his Ecclesiastical Monarchs with a clear and authentick Commission in his Word, that no stubborn Presbyter might contest their Right, or stiff-necked Protestant Churches refuse them their due? And seeing there is no such thing on Record in Scripture, have we not reason to conclude, That Christ never intended the Bishops should have such a Privilege? Who can blame the Council of *Chalcedon* for granting to New Rome or *Constantinople* the same Privileges with Old Rome, seeing the Scriptures speak nothing of the Preheminence of the Bishop of Rome to all other Bishops? Or the Council of *Milevus* in *Africa*, for condemning and prohibiting Transmarine Appeals, seeing there is nothing to be found of the Universal Supremacy of the Bishops of Rome in the word of God? In like manner, seeing there is as little in the Word of God concerning the Negative

tive Voice of Bishops, how can the Church of *Scotland* be justly blam'd for refusing to their Bishops such a Prerogative? And if it be pretended, that a Negative Voice is granted to the Bishops in Scripture, we would be content to know where, or what Texts this peerless Privilege may be inferred from †.

In Scripture, the Apostles frequently take occasion to treat of the Church, speak of its Nature, Order, Unity, Edification, and Government; of the Officers

† Some think, that the Bishop's Negative may be inferr'd from *Titus* i. 5. *For this cause left I thee in Crete, that thou shouldest set in order the things that are wanting, and ordain Elders in every City, as I had appointed thee.* The Elders in *Crete*, say they, could not ordain without *Titus*, else it would have been needfuls to leave *Titus* there for that end, and if they could not ordain, and set in order the things that were behind, without him, he was *sine quo non*, or had a Negative among them.

I shall not insist on this, that *Titus* was an Evangelist, and that an Argument from an Evangelist to a Bishop will not follow. Nor take Advantage by denying that there were any Presbyters or Elders at *Crete* at that time. Neither shall I insist on this, that if *Titus* had a Negative as to Ordination, he had a Negative as to Election, which belongs to the People, but that he had a Negative with respect thereto, is contrary to Scripture and Antiquity; *Quando Plebs ipsa maxime habeat Potestatem vel dignos Sacerdotes eligendi, vel indignos rejiciendi.* Neither shall I lay the stress of my Answer on the Consideration that *Crete* was a large Isle, in which were many Diocesan Churches according to the Prelatical Supposition; so that if *Titus* had a Negative with respect to Ordination in every City, that is Episcopal Church, the Inference will be, not that the Bishop had a Negative in the Presbytery, with respect to the Ordination of Presbyters and Deacons, &c. but that the Metropolitan had a Negative in the Synod among the Bishops of the Province, which spoils the Demonstration, this being not true, and a thing not pretended to by the Prelatists themselves.

But passing by all these things, I say there is no necessity at all that we should infer from these words of the Apostle, that *Titus* had a Negative in the Presbytery or Presbyteries in *Crete*, the Point may be illustrated by such an Example as this. If the *Danish* King were in *Flanders* and should leave 5000 Men behind him, and should after his return home, send them this word, *For this cause left I you in Flanders that ye may oppose the French in all their Designs, or fight them in every City.* What would be in these words to move us to infer, that these *Danes* had a Negative upon the Confederates, so that they could not fight the *French* without them. How easy is it to imagine, that *Titus* might be left there to assist the Presbyters in their Affairs, (as the *Danes* might the Confederate Army against the *French*) and to remain in that place till things should be set on a right Foot, and the Presbyters acquire some dexterity in managing the Government of the Church; a thing not to be attain'd to in a moment, but by some Use and Experience. The Presbyters there were but lately ordain'd, nay but newly converted to the Christian Faith, wherefore it may be very well imagined, that the Apostle might leave for some time among them, *Titus* an old and experienced Minister, to direct and assist them in the management of their Ecclesiastical Affairs, without supposing that he had a Negative Voice over them. In a word, no such thing can be inferr'd from what the Apostle writes to *Titus*, till it be first proven, that it was impossible *Paul* could leave *Titus* to assist or help the Presbyters in *Crete*, or that it was not possible he could assist or help them, unless he had a Negative Voice over them.

cers of the Church, their Election, Ordination, the distinction of them into several Kinds, their Qualifications, Graces, Privileges, of Subjection and Obedience, and the Honour and Love that is due to them : And how is it possible that they should never have spoken one word, never have made the least mention, upon any of these Occasions, of this Monarchical Privilege of a Negative, if they had known it was the Mind of Christ that some of his Ministers, or the Bishops, should be invested therewith in the Church ? A dreadful and unaccountable Omission this would have been, (if the Prerogative we are speaking of did really belong to them) it being a Point of such mighty Importance in the Government, nay the very principal thing in the whole external Administration of Christs House or Kingdom.

The Apostles frequently inculcate Duties of all sorts in their Writings, to God and Man, Duties of Inferiors to Superiors, of Subjects to higher Powers, of Children to Parents, of Servants to Masters, of Christians to one another, and forget not to press Obedience to our Spiritual Guides, or the Conducters and Rulers of the Church, *We beseech you Brethren saith Paul, to know them which labour among you, and over you in the Lord, and admonish you, and to esteem them very highly in Love for their Works sake. And again, Obey them that have the Rule over you, and submit your selves, for they watch for your souls as they that must give account, &c.* But if the Bishops have this Prerogative we are speaking of, have we not reason to wonder, that there is never one Precept or Command, never one Advice, Direction or Exhortation, whether to Presbyters or People, to pay this Deference to their supream Ecclesiastical Rulers, and not to grudge them this Privilege Christ had granted them, without which there could be no Bishop at all in our Brethren's sense, it being as impossible to conceive an Ecclesiastical Monarch with-

out this in the Church, as it is to conceive a Civil Monarch or King without a Negative Voice in the Parliament. We are told, the Apostles deposited this Negative in the hands of the Bishops *in remedium Schismatis*, on purpose to prevent Divisions; believe some, and it is impossible to keep out Divisions without it, we may as well think of guiding a Ship in a Storm without a Helm, as to keep up Unity in the Church without a Bishop (and a Negative) to sit as *Steers-Man* therein: It is well known how frequently the Apostles recommend Union, and with what earnestness and fervency, *I Paul beseech you by the meekness and gentleness of Christ. If there be therefore any Consolation in Christ, if any Comfort of Love, if any Fellowship of the Spirit, if any Bowels of Mercies, fulfil ye my Joy, that you be like minded, &c.* Is it not strange then, that never one of them should so much as once mention this so necessary Remedy of Schism, that it never entered into the Thoughts of any of them to recommend that, without which the so much desir'd and recommended Union, could not possibly be attain'd? That not so much as one of the Apostles thought this Negative worth the speaking of, or worth one Recommendation in any of their Epistles?

Let no person tell us here, (as it is reported Bishop Lightoun said once in a Sermon) that the Apostles mention or mind as little to recommend Obedience to Presbyteries, Synods, and General-Assemblies, &c. but with the good leave of that great Man, or these who are of his mind, the Apostles urge Subjection and Obedience to Church Rulers, and what are Assemblies, Synods, or Presbyteries, but Companies of Church Rulers? If we must obey them that have the Rule over us, I hope it will not be thought we should disobey them, when they are assembled together in Church Judicatories? Should the Apostles and Elders have been disobeyed, because they

they assembled together in a Synod or Presbytery, *Acts 15.* and formed Ecclesiastical Canons in a joint way? If we admit Church Officers to our Judicatories who have no Commission in the Word of God, and of whom there is no mention in the Writings of the ancient Fathers, let us be blamed for it.

In the Scriptures there are several Directions to the Governours of the Church, with respect to the Management of their Power, and particularly that they do not overstretch by *Lording it over God's Heritage*, and that they take not upon them to exercise *Dominion* in the Church: they are reprov'd for Neglect of the due Exercise of that Power Christ had intrusted them with, *Notwithstanding I have a few things against thee, because thou sufferest that VVoman Jezebel to teach and to seduce my servants, &c.* And is it not wonderful, that from the one end of the Scripture to the other, there is never one Direction to the Bishops with respect to this Monarchical Privilege they pretend to; never one Command to them to exert it when the good of the Church requires, when Divisions are like to arise, when the Presbytery or People are unreasonable, or the like: Never one Reproof to any of them for using it unseasonably, and to the disadvantage of the Church: Never one Limitation set to this dangerous Privilege: Never one Caution to manage it so as not to abuse it to the ruine of the Church; especially considering what Advantage the Bishops would have thereby to order things *ad libitum*, and to dispose all Ecclesiastical Concerns to their own Grandeur and temporal Advantage, to the ruine of Discipline, subversion of Christian Liberty, growth of Superstition, Heresy, Profanity, &c.

Seing then, the Scriptures are totally silent as to this Negative Voice of the Bishops, seing there is no word thereof directly or indirectly in the Writings of the Apostles; can these be blam'd who reject

ject or set themselves to oppose it? No more certainly, than they who reject a Doctrine that cannot be proved by Scripture, or refuse to submit to the Pope, pretending to a Power Christ never gave him, of being Universal Bishop, supreme and infallible Judge of Controversies, or the like. We have all the reason in the World to reject this Episcopal Prerogative, the Fathers themselves being Judges. *Let Hermogenes make it appear that it is written. (saith Tertullian) or if it be not written in Scripture. let him be afraid of that VVo against those who add or take away, &c. (a) And Lactantius, These things have no Foundation and Solidity, which are not upholden by any of the Oracles of the Divine Scriptures. (b) And Augustine, I about Christ, or about his Church, or about any other thing which concerneth our Faith and Life, I will not say we, who are no wise comparable to him, who said, Altho we, but even as he going on did add, If an Angel from Heaven should tell you beside what you have received in the Legal or Evangelical Scriptures, let him be Anathema c.*

Secondly, As the Scriptures are wholly silent as to this Privilege, so also are the Fathers; not so much as one of them for many hundred Years after Christ affirms, that the Prerogative of a Negative in the Church or Presbytery is the Bishop's due, whether by Divine or Humane Appointment, or that the Bishops actually had such a Privilege in their day, the Judicatories Ecclesiastical. A thing altogether impossible, if the Bishops really had such a Right and exerted the same..

L

(a) Scriptum esse doceat Hermogenis Officina. Si non est scriptum, meae vix illud adicientibus aut detrahentibus destinatum. Tertul. a Hermog. c. 22.

(b) Nec ullum fundamentum aut firmitatem possunt habere quæ non divinarum vocum fulciuntur Oraculis. Lact. lib. 7. sect. 2.

c Proinde sive de Christo, sive de ejus Ecclesia, sive de quacunque alia re, c pertinet ad fidem vitamque nostram, non dicam nos nequaquam comparari ei qui dixit, *Incet si nos*, sed omnino quod sequutus adiecit, *Si Angelus dei vobis annuntiaverit præterquam quod in Scripturis legalibus ac Evangelicis cepisset, Anathema sit, &c.* Contra Petilian 3. 6.

Let the Epistle of *Clemens* be considered. The Church of *Corinth*, falling into a great disorder, did throw out or depose all or most of their Presbyters most unjustly; upon this Occasion, *Clemens* in the Name of the Church of *Rome*, wrote to them a very grave, smart, and judicious Epistle, reproving them severely for that scandalous and unaccountable Action. Whereupon I say, either there was a Bishop with a Negative Voice in that Church, or not. If not, we have gain'd our Point. If there was, he either concurr'd in that unjust Deposition of the Presbyters, or not: If he did, he was the person in that Church that was chiefly to be blamed, and therefore *Clemens* should have reproved him principally, and in the first place, as our Saviour did the Angels of the Seven Churches in his Epistles *Revel. ch. 2. and 3.* Yet *Clemens* takes no notice of him at all, reaches no Reproof to him directly or indirectly in the whole Epistle, a thing altogether incredible upon the Supposition there was such a Bishop there, and guilty of such a Misbehaviour, unless ye will fancy that *Clemens* was guilty of an Oversight bordering upon Stupidity. If the Bishop did not concur in that unjust Deposition, how comes it that he did not interpose with his Negative Voice and hinder it; or that *Clemens* did not reprove him for this Neglect, or reproach him for not exerting his Negative Voice on such a necessary Occasion, and hindering the Deposition of the Presbyters when he could have done it so easily? Or if he was afraid of the People, and durst not exert his Negative on that necessary Occasion; how comes it that *Clemens* did not upbraid him with Cowardise, and deserting the Cause of Christ, or did not tell him, that he behaved unsuitably to his Character, and betrayed the trust that Christ had committed to him? How comes he did not tell him, That if Bishops make not use of their Power and Negative Voice on such

necessary Occasions, and when the Good of the Church so evidently requires it, it is given to them in vain? How comes it he did not tell him, that by that Neglect he was guilty of the Peoples sin, and that that scandalous putting away of the honest Presbyters was wholly or principally imputable to him? Or how can it reasonably be supposed, that such Bishops had not the Courage to oppose such a disorderly Action of the People, who had the Courage to encounter with Fire and Faggot, and to out-brave the cruellest Torments the Heathens could invent against them? And if so be, that they deposed the Presbyters whether the Bishop would or not, slighting him and his Negative Voice, how is it that *Clemens* did not reprove them for this? How comes it, that he was not severe upon them for rebelling against their Ecclesiastical Monarch, and dissolving the Discipline of the Church, by refusing him his Negative Voice, which God himself had intrusted him with? But if it be supposed without Ground or any shadow of Probation, and meerly to serve the Hypothesis, that the See of *Corinth* was Vacant at that nick of time, when *Clemens* wrote to them, or when the Presbyters were turned out, how comes it that *Clemens* did not admonish them that they were rash and precipitant, that they should not have taken upon them to turn out their Presbyters at their own hand tho they had been guilty of Misdemeanours, but should have waited until they had got a Bishop constituted among them, *Qui ejus rei potuisset cum autoritate & Consilio rationem habere*, as the Presbyters of *Rome* said to *Cyprian* when their See was vacant by the death of *Fabian*? *Tempora mutantur*, it seems it was otherwise with the Bishop then, than it was in the days of *Clemens*. However, the total Silence of *Clemens* as to these things, makes it clearly evident, that he was wholly ignorant of a Bishop with a Negative Voice.

Further, I would be content to know, how the Bishop's Negative Voice can be reconciled with what *Clemens* saith in this same Epistle, viz. *VWho among you is Noble and generous? who has Bowels of Compassion? who is full of Charity? let him say, If for my sake there be Sedition and Strife, and Divisions, I will depart and go whither you would have me, and do what shall be commanded me by the Multitude, Καὶ τοιαῦτα προσασόμενα ὑπὸ τῶ πλήθους* If the Bishop had such a Prerogative as they pretend, *Clemens* could not have exhorted any of the *Corinthians* to obey what should be enjoin'd by the Multitude or Church, for the Bishop might have interposed with his Negative, and disannull'd their Commands, and render'd them ineffectual; so that it would have been sinful, nay Rebellion against the Ecclesiastical Monarch, to obey them.

And as *Clemens Romanus* was wholly ignorant of the Bishop's Negative Voice, so was *Clemens Alexandrinus*. Otherwise he would not have said, That the Discipline of the Church whereby Men are made better, was *Penes Presbyteros*, in the Power of the Presbyters, *Strom. lib. 7.* If one should say, That in *Scotland* to make Laws is in the Power of the Parliament, he would speak an untruth, seing the Parliament has but the one half of that Power, the other half thereof being lodged in the King, so that without the concurrence of his Authority, the Act of Parliament is no more Obligatory, than the Act of a private Person would be. Wherefore if the Bishop had a Negative Voice, *Clemens* could not without speaking an Untruth, have said, That the Discipline of the Church was in the power of the Presbyters. Unless you will say, That he was writing laxely, and not intending to give a nice Account of the Affair.

Look to *Ignatius*, every body knows he was not for diminishing the Episcopal Prerogatives; but on the

contrary, was a most zealous Asserter of them, and for carrying them as high as he could, and doth frequently and fervently inculcate Obedience to the Bishop on all Occasions, and I may say even to excess, as if Religion, Salvation, and All depended upon it, so that his Zeal doth sometimes carry him to Expressions which are not very decent, and can't easily be defended; but as to this Monarchical Power, and Negative Voice of the Bishop, not one word about it in any of his Epistles. And certainly none who will read the Epistles of this Author, whoever he was, and considers the Humour he was in, will think, that he would have neglected either to mention or recommend this Negative Power, if he had ever heard of, or known such a thing.

It is true, *Ignatius* says to the Church of *Smyrna*, *Let no Man do anything of what belongs to the Church without the Bishop.* But it cannot be concluded from this or the like Sayings in *Ignatius's* Epistles, that the Bishop had a Negative Voice then.

It must be remembred in the first place, That *Ignatius* is a Writer whose words must not be alwise urged too far, or taken in too strict a sense, e.g. He says in his Epistle to *Polycarp*, *If any think that he knows more than the Bishop he is ruin'd.* If this be, what will become of those who have such a Bishop as was *Papias* of whom *Eusebius* says, That he was a Man of very weak Judgment?

In the next place, it was appointed by the Canons, *That the Bishops of the Province should do nothing without the Metropolitan.* In the 4th Canon of the Council of *Nice* we have these Words, *The validity of what is done in the Province depends on the Metropolitan.* And says the Council of *Antioch*, Anno 341. in their 9. Canon, *That the Bishops in the Province should reverence the Metropolitan, and do nothing of Consequence without him.* Yet the Metropolitan had no Negative Voice in the Synod of Bishops: And the

the learn'd Dr. Barrow proves very solidly, he had no such Voice there. See *Pop. Sup.* p. 314. in *Quarto*. And says the famous Mr. Dodwel, *The most ancient Metropolitan Rights pretended to by the Primitive Christians, were not of any real Jurisdiction, but only of Rank and Order.* One Altar, &c. p. 254. And this is very evident from the 6. Canon of the Council of Nice, which appoints, *That if two or three make Opposition, the Suffrages of the Plurality shall carry it.* For if the Metropolitan had a Negative Voice, the Suffrages of the Plurality would not have carried it; if he had interposed with his Negative not only the Plurality would not have carried it, but the unanimous Suffrages of the whole Synod would not have carried it.

And many of the Fathers call'd *Peter, Prince of the Apostles*, yet they knew very well, and affirmed frequently, that all the Apostles were equal, and that *Peter* had no Negative Voice over them. But if the Metropolitan had a Negative Voice in the Synod of Bishops, how ridiculous was this Canon of one of the Councils of *Carthage*, which forbids the Metropolitan to assume the Title of *Prince of the Priests, or the Sovereign Priest*, and declares, That no other Name ought to be given to him, but that of *Bishop of the first See*. If *Peter* who had no Negative Voice among the Apostles, was stiled by the Fathers, *Prince of the Apostles*, they could not in Reason have refused the Title of *Prince of the Bishops to the Metropolitan*, if he had a Negative Voice among the Bishops of the Province.

Then if the Metropolitan had a Negative in the Synod of the Bishops, the Episcopal Office could not reasonably have been call'd the *Sublime Top of the Priesthood*; neither could *Jerom* have said, That all Bishops are equal †. On the contrary, if the

T 2

Mc-

† Si Autoritas quaeritur, Orbis major est Urbe, ubicunque fuerit Episcopus, sive Romæ, sive Eugubii, sive Constantinopoli, sive Rhegii, sive Alexandria, sive Tanis, ejusdem meriti, ejusdem est & Sacerdotii, potentia divitiarum, & paupertatis humilitas, vel sublimiorem, vel inferiorem Episcopum non facit. *Micro. Evagr. Ep. 85.*

Metropolitan had such a Princely Prerogative, he was equal to all the Bishops in the Synod or Province.

Wherefore seing it cannot be inferr'd, That the Metropolitan had a Negative Voice, because nothing was to be done in the Province without him, as little can it be concluded, that the Bishop had a Negative, because nothing was done without him in the Church Diocess or Presbytery. And let it be remember'd here, that ordinarily the Presbytery was to do nothing in the Bishop's absence, tho when he was present, he had no Negative Voice at all, and this satisfieth the Expressions in *Ignatius's* Epistles.

And what Probability is there, that the Bishops had a Negative Voice in *Ignatius's* time, seing they had no such Prerogative many Ages after, not in *Isodore's* time who was Bishop of *Sevil* in the 7th. Century, unless ye will suppose he spoke wonderfully, carelessly and indistinctly with respect to the Presbyters, in his second Book of Offices, when he said, *That they preside over the Churches, as the Bishops do consecrate the Body and Blood of Christ, and preach the Word of God as they do, but that Ordination is reserved to the Bishops to maintain the Authority and Splendour of the Priesthood, and to prevent Divisions.* How could it have been said, That the Presbyters presided over the Churches as the Bishops did, if the Bishops had a Negative Voice in the Churches? And does he not speak of *Ordination* as the only thing * in the Government of the Church, or Matter of Discipline wherein the *ὑπεροχή* of the Bishop did ly? *Summo sacerdoti Clericorum Ordinatio reservata, ne a multis Ecclesie Disciplina vendicata, concordiam solverit*; says he.

To the same purpose the 2d. Council of *Sevil* Anno

619,

* To the same purpose *Chrysostom* and *Jerom*, *Quid facit excepta Ordinatione Episcopus quod Presbyter non faciat.* And *Augustine* thought, that this Preheminence which the Bishop had in the Presbytery, was such a small and inconsiderable thing, that he said the Bishop was greater than a Presbyter only *Secundum bonorum Vocabula.* In an Epistle to *Jerom*,

619, against some Presbyters who had been allow'd by Agapius a Bishop, to ineroach upon the Episcopal Prerogatives, or had taken upon them to do some things which could not be canonically done but by a Bishop, did make an Act, and rid Marches between the Bishops and the Presbyters, thus,

Altho, say they, Presbyters have several Functions common with the Bishops, there be some forbidden them by the Ecclesiastical Laws, (quædam novellis & Ecclesiasticis Regulis sibi prohibita noverint) such as the Consecration of Presbyters, Deacons, or Virgins, the erection of an Altar, the blessing of the Unction : That they cannot consecrate an Altar or a Church, nor confer the Holy-Ghost by imposition of hands, on the baptised or on heretical Converts, nor consecrate the holy Chrism, nor anoint the forehead of the baptized therewith, nor so much as reconcile a Penitent in a publick Mass, nor send Circular Letters : That all these things are forbidden to Presbyters, because they have not the supreme Degree of the Sacerdotal Dignity, which by the Authority of the Canons is appropriated to Bishops only. And they add, That Presbyters are not permitted to enter into the Baptistry, nor to baptize before the Bishop, nor to reconcile Penitents without his Order, nor to consecrate the Body and Blood of Christ, to Preach, to bless or salute the People in the presence of the Bishop.

Perhaps the greater part of the Episcopal Diocesses in Spain consisted of more Congregations than one in those days, yet it seems they were but small, and did not consist of many Congregations even then ; for if they had, the Bishop could not have sent Orders to a Presbyter every time a Penitent was to be reconciled, as says this Council. And the Bishop was still look'd on as sole Pastour of the Diocess according to the ancient way (seing the Presbyters could not administer the Sacraments, or bless the People in his presence, that being a Work incumbent upon him) tho he could not without great
ab.

absurdity be look'd on as such, when the Diocess came to comprehend many distinct Congregations. However in these things did the Difference between the Presbyters and their Moderator the Bishop ly at that time, and if he had any other Advantages above them in the Presbytery, it seems they were so very inconsiderable, that this venerable *Spanish* Council thought them not worth the mentioning, wherefore it is nowise probable, that he had the princely Prerogative of a Negative then.

But, I believe, the main Stress of the Cause will be laid on *Cyprian*, tho in vain, for there is nothing in his Works from whence this may be inferr'd; but there are many Passages in them from which it may be clearly proved, that the Bishop had no Negative Voice at all. If *Cyprian* had a Negative Voice, he had as much Power as the Church, the Church's Power and his was equal; but it was not so, the Power of the Church was greater than his, as he declareth positively and expresly, Ep. 39 *, where to himself as Bishop he attributes *Suasio* only, but to the Church he attributes *compulsio* and *coactio*, and of the Church he says *Cui plus licuit, i. e. VVbi* Authority was greater, and which had more power than the Bishop, who am but a Minister or Servant. In all Monarchies, the Right of creating Officers Civil or Military, resideth in the King. If then *Cyprian* was Monarch of the Church of *Carthage*, how came *Celerinus* to refuse to take upon him so much as the Office of a Lector by vertue of *Cyprian's* Authority. How comes it that the Admonition of the Church tho but in a nocturnal Vision, compelled him when *Cyprian's* Authority had no Influence on him at all. This is Demonstration, that *Cyprian* was no Monarch, and had no Negative. And I dare say That *Cyprian* did not imagine, that Christ investe

* Qui cum consentire dubitaret, Ecclesiæ ipsius admonitu & hortatu visione per noctem, Compulsus est ne negaret nobis suadentibus, cui plus licuit quæ & coegit.

the Bishops with this Privilege when he said, Ep. 14. *Ad id vero quod scripserunt mihi Compresbyteri Donatus, &c. Solus rescribere nihil potui, quando a primordio, Episcopatus mei statuerim nihil sine Consilio vestro, & sine consensu Plebis, meâ privatim sententiâ gerere, sed cum ad vos per Dei gratiam venero, tunc de iis quæ vel gesta sunt vel gerenda, in commune tractabimus.* If he resolved never to do any thing without their Counsel and Consent, he resolved never to exert a Negative Voice without their Consent, *that is*, in effect, never to exert any Negative Voice at all, if the *Triunes* could not interceed but when the Senate consented, their Prerogative of Interceeding was intirely frustrated. It signifies nothing to say, That this Resolution was voluntar Condescension in *Cyprian*; or that was voluntarily to renounce his Prerogative: And if Christ really invested the Bishops with the Prerogative of a Negative Voice, such a Resolution, or voluntar Condescension, was impious, it was plain Rebellion, a frustrating the Designs that Christ had, in investing the Bishops with this Prerogative. If the Bishops really had a Negative in the Church, Christ said to *Cyprian* upon the Matter, *I intrust you as Bishop with a Negative Voice, in the Church of Carthage, which you are faithfully to exert as oft as my Glory and the good of that Church requires it, and that as ye will Answer at the Great Day.* And what Answers *Cyprian* in the words here cited? *I have resolved*, says he, *from the beginning of my Episcopacy, never to take upon me a Negative Voice at all.* says *I. S.* this must be imputed to the self denied Man's voluntary Condescension to his Presbyters and People. But should he have rebelled against his Avour, or betrayed his Trust, or frustrated the Designs Christ had, by intrusting the Bishops with a Negative Voice, that he might condescend to the Presbyters or People? But *Cyprian* was of no such temper; wherefore we may conclude, he knew

nothing of the Bishop's Negative Voice. Further if *Cyprian* had known, that he had the Prerogative of a Negative Voice, no doubt he would have made use of it, when the disorderly Presbyters did most precipitantly, nay impiously, admit the Lapsers to the Table of the LORD, before the time appointed by the Canons, before they discovered any Evidences of Repentance; and even when their mouths and hands were yet warm with the blood of the Sacrifices they had offered to the Pagan Idols. Certainly, if ever it was necessary, that a Bishop should exert a Negative Voice, that was the time; and if *Cyprian* did not so much as pretend to interpose with a Negative at that Occasion, we may safely conclude, that he never did it all his days, and never knew that he had such a Princely Prerogative. But so it is, that it never entered into *Cyprian's* thoughts, to interpose with a Negative on that Occasion.

The first notice that *Cyprian* takes of this Affair is in his 14. Ep. which is directed to the Presbyters and Deacons. It seems, the disorderly Presbyters had written to him, proposing, That the Lapsers might be received as was said, without the formality of making publick Profession of Repentance for some time, according to the Canons, and desiring to know his mind, and if he would consent. *Cyprian* answered in the words cited a little before, *As to what my Co-presbyters, Donatus, &c. have written, I alone could give no Answer, for I determined when I first entered into the Episcopal Office, to do nothing by my self without your counsel, and the Consent of the People.* Which is liker to an Answer from a Magistrate in a Republick, than a Monarch with Absolute Power, or a Negative Voice.

In the three following Epistles, to wit, the 15, 16 and 17. which were all written at the same time he speaks of it by way of Complaint, as a thing

already done, *Sed nunc cum maximo animi dolore cognosco, &c.* says he. And in Ep. 17. *Audiotamen quosdam de Presbyteris, nec Evangelii memores, &c. jam cum Lapsis communicare cœpisse, &c.*

Wherefore if it be said, That *Cyprian* interposed with a Negative Voice on this Occasion, it must either be supposed, that he did it by a Letter, written between the writing of the 14 and 15 Epistles, that is by a Letter not now extant; or that he did it after the thing was done, *that is*, after that the unruly Presbyters had begun to admit the Lapsers, and actually had admitted several of them, and consequently that he interposed with his Negative Voice unseasonably, and not to the purpose: Or it must be supposed, that he did it by some Proxie or Vicar without an Epistle, for he was absent himself at that time from *Carthage*.

In the first place, If it should be said, That he made use of a Proxie, or exerted his Negative Voice by a Vicar, that would be a Supposition altogether groundless; *Cyprian* says nothing any where, either directly or indirectly, from whence such an Inference may be drawn; the Presbyters might have excepted against him, or rejected him, unless he could have produced his Commission, or an Epistle under *Cyprian's* hand. But it is needless to debate on this Head; for if *Cyprian* exerted any Negative at all on this Occasion, he did it by a Letter, as is evident from the Account he giveth of his Conduct in the whole Affair to the Presbytery of *Rome*, in Ep. 20. *Et quid egerim, says he, loquuntur vobis Epistolæ pro temporibus emissæ, numero tredecim, quas ad vos transmissi, in quibus nec clero consilium, nec confessoribus exhortatio defuit, &c. Literas feci quibus Martyres & confessores consilio meo quantum possem ad Dominica præcepta revocarem. Item, Presbyteris & Diaconibus non defuit Sacerdotii vigor, ut quidam minus Disciplina memores & temeraria festinatione præcipientes, qui cum*

Lapsis communicare jam cœperant, comprimerentur, intercedentibus nobis. Our Prelatists have no Argument to prove, that *Cyprian* interposed with a Negative Voice on this Occasion, but what is founded on thir words, *Intercedentibus nobis*; and seing the Intercession *Cyprian* here speaks of, whatever the Nature of it may be, was by Epistle, we may safely conclude, that if he did not exert his Negative Voice by an Epistle, he did it no way.

But if it be suppos'd, That he exerted his Negative Voice by an Epistle in due time, *that is*, before the Presbyters committed the Crime, or received the Lapsers the way we have said, it is evident by what is already said, that this Negative behoved to be exerted by an Epistle written between the 14. and 15. Epistles, *that is*, by an Epistle which is now lost, and which no Person ever heard of, or mentioned, or said that they did see. I say to this,

1. What probability is there, that this Epistle alone should be lost, when so many other Epistles which *Cyprian* wrote on this Occasion to the Presbytery, Confessors, and People, are still extant?

2. If *Cyprian* had any where affirmed, That he did oppose the disorderly Proceedings of the said Presbyters, by making use of his Prerogative of a Negative Voice against them, there would be reason for saying that he did so, and that the Epistle whereby he did it, is lost. But when *Cyprian* says no such thing in any of his Works, to pretend that he did so actually, but that the Epistle whereby he did it is lost, is plainly ridiculous. Why may not the Presbyterians pretend the same way, That *Cyprian* own'd himself to be inferior to the Presbytery, and promised Obedience and Subjection thereto, and that the Epistle is lost in which he did so?

3. If ever there was such a Letter, whereby *Cyprian* exerted his Negative Voice after that the 14. and before the 15. Epistle was written, it must necessarily

cessarily be supposed, that it was one of these he mentions in the 20th Epistle, which is directed to the Presbytery of *Rome*, *that is*, that it was one of the 13th he mentions in that Epistle, and of which he sent a Copy to that Presbytery. For he sent a Copy of these 13 Letters to the Presbytery of *Rome*, on purpose to Vindicate his Conduct during the time of his absence from *Carthage*, and to justify his Management, especially with respect to the Lapsed, or to clear himself as to the undue Reception of them, contrary to the Laws of the Gospel and the Canons of the Church. And this Letter (if such there was) was certainly more considerable than any of the rest, gave Account of the most important Step he had made in the whole Affair, manifested his Diligence and Pastoral Vigilance, made his Faithfulness in the discharge of the Trust committed to him to appear, and was the most Authentick Evidence he could give of the Vigour of his Episcopal Office, which he says, he manifested on that Occasion. When then he sent to the Presbytery of *Rome*, a Copy of the several Letters he had written during his Retirement, to the Confessors, the Presbyters and Deacons, and to the People of *Carthage*, that that Presbytery might have a punctual and exact Information of his whole Procedure, of his *Actus*, *Disciplina*, and *Diligentiæ ratio* as he expresses it; we may look on't as certain, that this Letter we are speaking of was one of them, *that is*, one of the 13. And if this be obstinately denied, let a Reason be given why it should be supposed, that he would send to *Rome* a Transcript of all the Letters he wrote to *Carthage* during his Retirement, and neglect to send a Copy of that principal and most considerable One, on which his Justification or the Vindication of his Conduct did wholly depend? That is to say, Let a Reason be given why it should be supposed, that *Cyprian* was a Fool. But there

was no such Letter sent to *Rome*: All that were sent thither were to the number of 13, and all these 13 are still extant, as the Learn'd Bishop of *Chester* makes evidently to appear in his *Cyprian: Annal: vide ad ann: 258, Paragr: 11 & 12.* And says the Bishop of *Oxford, Ordinem præcedentium 13 Epistolarum, quæ hic deinceps sequuntur (viz. in Epistola 20.) mirifice confirmant.* It is evident then, that there never was such a Letter. Wherefore I say, seing no Letter can be produced, whereby *Cyprian* did exert his Negative Voice against the disorderly Presbyters before they admitted the Lapsers to Communion; and seing there never was such a Letter, it is evident, that he did not interpose with a Negative Voice at that time.

4. If it will still be supposed, contrary to the Opinion of the Bishops of *Chester* and *Oxford*, nay contrary to Truth and plain Matter of Fact, that *Cyprian* did exert his Negative Voice against the said Presbyters by a Letter between the 14 and 15 Epistles, and that a Copy of that Letter was sent to *Rome* among the rest, and that *Cyprian* was guilty of an harmless Mistake, like that *I. S.* speaks of p. 236, *that u.* miscounted the Letters, and said, that he sent 13, when he should have said 14, it must also be supposed, That the said Presbyters disregarded *Cyprian's* Negative Voice, and acted contrary thereto; for they did admit the Lapsers to Communion the way before said, neglecting *Cyprian's* Authority and Prerogative, as is evident from the 15, 16 and 17 Epistles. But if this was, how comes it that *Cyprian* takes no notice of it at all, either in the 15, 16 or 17 Epistle, which were writ immediately after this supposed rebellious Act of the disorderly Presbyters, or their flying in the Face of his Negative Voice? How comes it, that he does not so much as once complain of that notorious Piece of Injustice? How comes it, that he does not complain,

that

that by this means he was rob'd of that Prerogative he was alwise in possession of before, and which belongs to all Bishops as their unquestionable Right? How comes he tells them not, that such a Proceeding was an overturning the Discipline, and a setting up a new kind of Government, to overturn the Monarchy, and to set up an Aristocratical kind of Government in the Church, to bring in Parity contrary to the Institution of Jesus Christ, and the uniform and perpetual Practice of all the other Churches in the World? Or that he did not ask them with what Face or Conscience they could pretend to bereave him the Bishop of *Carthage*, of that Prerogative of a Negative Voice, which *Cæcilius*, *Primus*, *Polycarpus*, *Novatus*, and all the other little Bishops of *Africa*, had in their respective Presbyteries and Churches without Contradiction? If *Cyprian's* Negative Voice had been trampled upon, it is impossible he could have missed to fall into some Complaints of this kind, in these Epistles at least which he wrote immediately after; but nothing of this kind is hinted, or in the least insinuated by him, there is nothing in any of these three Epistles that looks like a complaining, That his Negative Voice was disown'd or pass'd by these disorderly Presbyters. If the Parliament should Petition the King for his Assent to an Act *c. gr.* for a Triennial Parliament, and if, notwithstanding his refusing his Assent thereto, the Parliament should pass the Act, would the King, think you, take no notice of the Affront in his next Letters or Speech to the Parliament? Would there never be one Complaint of invading the Royal Prerogatives, of bereaving him of that Privilege all his Predecessors before him did enjoy? On the contrary would he not tell them, That that was to dissolve the Government, &c. A Man would be laughen at if he should make such a Supposition as this: Yet a King might more easily part with his Negative Voice,

Voice, than *Cyprian* could have done, if he had any; for if he had it, according to the Supposition, he had it as a Trust committed to him by God and Jesus Christ, and consequently he could not part with it without betraying his Trust, and being guilty of Rebellion against God Almighty.

Cyprian does indeed mightily condemn, and cry out against this wicked Procedure of these Presbyters, in the 15 Ep. directed to the Confessors, he says, That to admit the Lapsers to Communion after that manner, was to deceive them, it was so far from doing them good, that it rendred them more guilty before God, &c. *Ea enim concedere, quæ in perniciem vertant, decipere est, nec erigitur sic lapsus, sed per Dei offensam magis impellitur ad ruinam, &c.* And in Epist. 16. to the Presbyters, *Sed dissimulandi locus nunc non est, quando decipiatur Fraternitas nostra a quibusdam vestrum, qui dum sine ratione restituenda salutis plausibiles esse cupiunt, magis lapsis obsunt, &c.* And in Epist. 17. to the People, *Nam cum in minoribus delictis--- pœnitentia agatur justo tempore, & exomologesis fiat inspecta vita ejus qui agit pœnitentiam, nec ad communicationem venire quis possit: nisi prius ill. ab Episcopo & Clero manus fuerit imposita, quanto magis in his gravissimis & extremis delictis caute omnia & moderate secundum Disciplinam Domini observari oportet* But he does not complain, that they received them after he had interposed with his Negative Voice, or that his Right was taken from him, and Prerogative trampled upon by their receiving them after that manner.

Perhaps it may be said, That *Cyprian* did complain that they acted contrary to his Negative Voice, and deprived him thereof, because he said, That by receiving the Lapsers after that manner, they did no reserve to him the Honour that was due to him a Bishop, That they forgot their own Station and did not mind his Degree as *Præpositus*. Thus he said

in Epistle 16, directed to the Presbyters and Deacons, *Quando aliqui de Presbyteris, nec Evangelii, nec loci sui memores, sed neque futurum Domini Judicium, neque nunc sibi præpositum Episcopum cogitantes, quod nunquam omnino sub antecessoribus factum est, cum contumelia & contemptu Præpositi totum sibi vendicant?* And in Ep. 17, to the People, *Audio tamen quosdam de Presbyteris--- nec Episcopo honorem sacerdotii sui & Cathedræ reservantes jam cum Lapsis communicare cœsisse, &c.* And to the same purpose in Ep. 15, to the Confessors, *Nec timorem Dei, nec Episcopi honorem cogitantes, &c.*

But it cannot be inferr'd hence, that Cyprian had interposed with a Negative Voice, and that he complains, that the disorderly Presbyters had refused him the same. And 1. As to the *Honor Sacerdotii* and *Cathedræ*, which Cyprian says, the disorderly Presbyter's rob'd him of by their Procedure; how is it proven, that the robbing him of that Honour was robbing him of his Negative Voice? I affirm, that it implieth no such thing. As to his saying in the 2. place, of these Presbyters, *Totum sibi vendicant.* These words would indeed imply, that the Presbyters robbed him of his Negative Voice, if he had such a Voice; but I hope it must first be proven, that he had a Negative Voice, before it can be said, that these words imply, That the disorderly Presbyters robbed him of it. Suppose, that the King granted a Commission to the Earls of A, B, C, D. to manage the Affairs of the Treasury, and suppose that the Earls of A, B, C, conspired together, and managed these Affairs by themselves, not permitting the Earl of D, to meddle in the Business, it might very well be said, *Totum sibi vendicant cum contemptu & contumelia* of the Earl of D. But it would not at all follow thence, that the Earl of D. had a Negative over the rest.

It must be remember'd here, that tho the Bishop had no Negative Voice in the Presbytery, and all things there were carried by Plurality of Voices, yet, as was said, he had this Prerogative in the days of *Cyprian*, that the Presbytery was to do nothing of Consequence in his absence, nothing without advising with him, (thus the disorderly Presbyters, as disorderly as they were, sent word to *Cyprian*, and advised with him, before they admitted the Lapsers, as is evident from the close of the 14 Epistle) and according to the Canons, some things behoved to be delayed till his Return, unless there was a Necessity of doing otherwise. Thus the Penitents used to be received again to Communion by imposition of the hands of the Bishop and Clergy. Wherefore if the Bishop was absent, the receiving of a Penitent us'd to be delay'd till his Return, excepting in case of Necessity. *Si incommodo aliquo & infirmitatis periculo occupati fuerint, non expectata præsentia nostra, apud Presbyterum quemque præsentem, vel si Presbyter repertus non fuerit, apud Diaconum quoque exomologesin facere delicti sui possint, ut manu in pœnitentia imposita veniant ad Dominum cum pace, &c.*

Now when the Presbyters admitted the Lapsers to Communion forthwith, before the time appointed by the Canons, before the Return of *Cyprian*, *Cyprian* was by this means slighted, he was deprived of his Privilege, to wit, of receiving the Penitent himself, and of laying his hands on them; and this was the *Honor Sacerdotii & Cathedræ*, which he complains, that the disorderly Presbyters by their hast and precipitant receiving of the Lapsers, deprive him of; by this means *Cyprian* was excluded from concurring in laying on hands on these Penitents in conjunction with the Presbytery or Clergy, and therefore he did exclaim against these Presbyte

quod totum sibi vendicant cum contemptu & contumelia Episcopi.

And that this was the *Honor Cathedræ & Sacerdotii*, which *Cyprian* complains these Presbyters deprived him of, and that he had nothing of a Negative Voice in his head, I shall not only affirm, but prove; and I prove it thus: *Cyprian* declares in his 16 Ep^{is} which is directed to the Presbytery, that the Confessors did not treat him so unhandsonly as these Presbyters had done. For whereas, says he, they deprive me of the Honour of my Chair and Priesthood, the Confessors on the contrary, reserve to me the Honour of my Chair and Priesthood. And what way did the Confessors reserve the Honour of his Priesthood and Chair to him? Because, says he, tho they petition'd for the Lapsers, yet they did not petition for their Reception before the ceasing of the Persecution, and *before my Return*. Therefore then the receiving of the Lapsers to Communion before his Return, and without the imposition of his hands as Bishop, was the Dishonour he complains these Presbyters did to him. *Ut cum illi (Martyres nempe) memores loci nostri ad me literas direxerint, & petierint tunc desideria sua examinari & pacem dari, quando ipsa ante Mater nostra Ecclesia pacem de misericordia Domini prior sumpserit & nos Divina protectio reduces ad Ecclesiam suam fecerit, hi (Presbyteri viz.) sublato honore, quem nobis beati Martyres cum confessoribus servant, contempta domini lege & observatione, quam iidem Martyres & confessores tenendam mandant, ante extinctum persecutionis metum ante reditum nostrum, ante ipsum pene Martyrum excessum, communicent cum lapsis & offerant, & Eucharistiam [iis] iradant.*

Seing then, no Letter of *Cyprian's* can be produced, whereby he did exert a Negative Voice against the disorderly Presbyters, before they received the Lapsers to Communion; nay, seing there never was such a Letter, seing that in the three Letters, (*viz.*

the 15, 16 and 17.) which were written by *Cyprian* immediately after the disorderly Reception of the Lapsers, and consequently immediately after the suppos'd Rebellion against his Episcopal Prerogative or Negative Voice; seing, I say, that in these three Letters, *Cyprian* speaks nothing of these Presbyters their rebelling against his Negative Voice, or disannulling his Prerogative, and makes no Complaint about it directly or indirectly, either to the Presbytery, or to the Martyrs or People; we may safely conclude, that he exerted no Negative Voice at that time, and that so to do was not at all in his thoughts, and consequently that he had no such Prerogative, seing he did not think of making use of it on such a necessary Occasion.

But if it be suppos'd in the next place, That *Cyprian* interposed with his Negative Voice some time after, *that is*, after that many of the Lapsers were actually admitted, for it can't be supposed that they were all admitted at once; or that he did not intend wholly to hinder that profane and scandalous Admission of the Lapsers, but only to put a Stop to the Progress of that Affair. I say,

1. Time a Day for *Cyprian* to come with his Negative Voice after the Affair was in a great measure over, after many of the Lapsers were actually received, after the Table of the Lord was profan'd by Idolaters, and after that these miserable Lapsers had through the perswasion, or by encouragement from the profane Presbyters *Eaten and drunken Damnation to themselves*, and had done that which in *Cyprian's* own Opinion, was pernicious to their Souls, *quæ in pernicem vertant*. Wherefore if *Cyprian* had a Negative Voice, to suppose, that he did not put it in execution till the time of his writing the 15, 16 and 17 Epistles, is to suppose, that he was as guilty as the profane Presbyters themselves, that he was a profane abuser of the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper,

per, and that he was guilty of the Body and Blood of the Lord, and guilty of the blood of the Souls of many belonging to his Flock, whom perhaps he might have hinder'd from that horrible abusing of the holy Sacrament, if he had interposed in due time, and before they were admitted. But *Cyprian* was no such Man, if he had known that Christ had intrusted him with a Negative Voice in that Church whereof he was Bishop, he would never have been so faithless, and unconscientious, or treacherous in the managing of it. He was a most vigilant Pastour, and if he had thought that he had a Negative Voice, he would certainly have nicked the Opportunity, and watch'd the true Season of putting it in execution, and taken care, that his Flock might not suffer thro' his neglecting to make use of his Prerogatives, and exert his Monarchical Power. If he had known that his Saviour had intrusted him with such a Prerogative, instead of saying in the close of his 14. Epistle, *Ad id vero quod scripserunt mihi Compresbyteri nostri, Donatus & Fortunatus, Novatus & Gordius, solus rescribere nihil potui*; he would have told them plainly, that if they profaned the holy Sacrament by admitting the Lapsers after that manner, they should do it in contempt of his Authority, and over the belly of his Negative Voice.

2. We desire, that the Letter may be produced or pointed at, whereby *Cyprian* either actually exerted that pretended Negative Voice; or in which he says, that he did so. No such thing can be inferr'd from his saying *Intercedentibus nobis* in the 20th. Ep. as will afterward appear.

3. If that Negative Voice was exerted, it must (as we have said) be suppos'd, that it was exerted before the writing of the 20. Epistle, which is directed to the Presbyters of Rome, (for it is therein that he says, *Ut quidam minus Disciplinæ memores comprimerentur intercedentibus nobis*) and after the

writing of Epistle 14, *that is*, either by the 15, or 16, 17, 18, or 19 Epistle. But he exerted no Negative by the 15 and 17 Epistles.

For First, In them there is nothing but Complaints against the procedure of the said Presbyters, and Arguings against the wickedness of the thing they did; but nothing either directly or indirectly of putting forth a Negative Voice against them, either of his having done it already, or his intending to do it afterward, or his actual exerting it at the time by any of these Epistles.

Secondly, There are several things in these Epistles which look not like his thinking to exert a Negative Voice, or his being conscious, that he had a Right or any Power to do it. Thus in Epistle 15, directed to the Martyrs, he expresses himself in these words, *Oro vos, quibus possum precibus, ut Evangelii memores, & considerantes quæ & qualia in præteritum Antecessores vestri Martyres CONCESSERINT, quam solliciti in omnibus fuerint, vos quoque solcite & caute petentium desideria ponderetis. Ne si quid abrupte & indigne, vel a vobis commissum, vel a vobis factum fuerit, apud Gentiles quoque ipsos Ecclesia nostra erubescere incipiat.* The Business was this, the disorderly Presbyters knowing that Cyprian was a Conscientious Man, and would never condescend, that the Lapsers should be admitted before the due time, at least, before they evidenced the sincerity of their Repentance; and resolving to have the thing done, whether he would or not, they set the Confessors a-work, or stirr'd up the Lapsers to importune them to Petition, *to wit*, That they might be received again to Communion forthwith, the Confessors having this Privilege granted to them for their Encouragement by the Canons, that these of the Lapsers for whom they did Petition, should be received again to Communion before the time appointed, according to the Discipline of the Church. But they were

were only to Petition for the Reception of such of the Lapsers, as in all humane probability were truly penitent, and weighted with a sense of their Crime. But through the instigation of the disorderly Presbyters, the Confessors did abuse this Privilege, and Petition'd for the Reception of many, who they had no Reason at all to think, were any manner of way affected with the sense of their sin.

When the Confessors did thus Petition for the Admission of the Lapsers, many of which were manifestly impenitent, *Cyprian* was highly displeas'd, as he had reason; but what did he say to the Confessors? Did he tell them, that he would not notice their unjust Petitions, or threaten, that he would make use of his Negative Voice, and by this means disappoint both them and the disorderly Presbyters who imposed upon them? No. But he falls a beseeching and intreating them, that they would be more mindful of the Laws of the Gospel, more considerate in their Petitions, and take more narrow inspection of the Behaviour, and better ponderate the Merit of these of the Lapsers in favours of whom they interpose. *Inspiciatis & Actum & Opera & Merita singulorum*, saith he. In like manner, when he wrote to the People about this Affair, in Epist. 17. he says, *Audiant quæso patienter Consilium nostrum, expectent regressionem nostram, ut cum ad vos per Dei misericordiam venerimus, convocati Coepiscopi plures, secundum Domini Disciplinam, & confessorum præsentiam, beatorum Martyrum literas & desideria examinare possimus*. Wherefore we conclude, that *Cyprian* exerted no Negative Voice by the 15. and 17. Epistles.

As little can it be said, That he exerted any Negative Voice by the 18. or 19. Epistle; for he declares himself in the 20 Epistle, that the *Intercession* he made, whatever the nature of it was, was made by him before the writing of the 18 and 19 Epistles.

Literas feci (says he in the 20. Epistle) *quibus Martyres & Confessores Consilio meo quantum possem ad Dominica Præcepta revocarem*; that was the 15. Epistle. *Item Presbyteris & Diaconibus non defuit Sacerdotii vigor, ut quidam minus Disciplinæ memores & temeraria festinatione præcipientes, qui cum lapsis communicare jam cæperant comprimerentur intercedentibus nobis*; that was the 16. Epistle. *Plebi quoque ipsi quantum potuimus animos composuimus, & ut Ecclesiastica Disciplina servaretur instruximus*; that was the 17. Epistle. *Postmodum vero cum quidam de lapsis, sive sua sponte, sive aliquo incitatore, audaci flagitatione prorumperent, &c. de hoc etiam bis ad Clerum literas feci*; these were the 18. and 19 Epistles.

What needs more, you see that Cyprian himself declares to the Presbytery of Rome, that the *Intercession* he made, whatever it was, was by his 16 Epistle, wherefore if he exerted any Negative Voice at all, he did it by that Epistle. But so it is, that there is nothing in that Epistle that looks like his exerting a Negative Voice, or that has any affinity therewith. I appeal to the Epistle it self. And because this is a Matter of great Consequence, and decisive of the Controversie, for the sake of these who have not the Works of Cyprian at hand, tho it be something troublesome and tedious, I shall set down the Epistle intire in the Margine †. When you have read the

† CYPRIANI Epistola XVI.

Cyprianus Presbyteris & Diaconibus Fratribus, salutem.

DIU patientiam meam tenui, Fratres charissimi, quasi verecundum silentium nostrum proficeret ad quietem. Sed cum quorundam immoderata & abrupta præsumptio temeritate sua, & honorem Martyrum, & Confessorum pudorem, & Plebis universæ tranquillitatem turbare conetur, tacere ultra non oportet, ne ad periculum & Plebis pariter & nostrum taciturnitas nimia procedat. Quod enim non periculum metuere debemus de offensa Domini; quando aliqui de Presbyteris, nec Evangelii, nec loci sui memores, sed neque futurum Domini iudicium, neque nunc sibi præpositum Episcopum cogitantes, quod nunquam omnino sub Antecessoribus factum est, cum contumelia & contemptu Præpositi totum sibi vendicant; Atque utinam non contra Fratrum nostrorum salutem sibi omnia vendica-

the Epistle, you will see, that after his blaming the Conduct of these disorderly Presbyters, and his disputing against their Procedure by several Arguments, he falls a threatening them, but says nothing directly or indirectly about exerting a Negative Voice against them. And he threatens, that in the mean

ent. Contumeliam Episcopatus nostri dissimulare & ferre possum, sicut dissimulavi semper & pertuli; Sed dissimulandi locus nunc non est; quando decipiatur Fraternitas nostra a quibusdam veltrum, qui dum sine ratione restituenda salutis plausibiles esse cupiunt, magis Lapsis obsunt. Summum enim delictum esse quod persecutio committi coegit, sciunt ipsi etiam qui commiserunt; cum dixerit Dominus & Judex noster: Qui me confusus fuerit coram hominibus, & ego illum confitebor coram Patre meo qui in Caelis. Qui autem me negaverit, & ego illum negabo. Et iterum dixit: Omnia peccata remittuntur filiis hominum & blasphemiae, qui autem blasphemaverit spiritum Sanctum, non habebit remissionem, sed reus est aeterni peccati. Item, Beatus Apostolus dixerit; Non potestis calicem Domini bere, & calicem daemoniorum. Hæc qui subtrahit Fratribus nostris, deperit miseris; ut qui possunt agentes poenitentiam veram, Deo qua Patri & misericordii precibus & operibus suis satisfacere: Seducantur ut magis peccant, & qui erigere se possent, plus cadant. Nam cum in minoribus peccatis agant peccatores poenitentiam iusto tempore, & secundum Disciplinæ ordinem ad exomologesin veniant, & per manus impositionem, Episcopi Cleri, jus Communicationis accipiant: Nunc crudo tempore, persecutio adhuc perseverante, nondum restituta Ecclesiæ ipsius pace, ad Communicationem admittuntur, & offertur nomen eorum, & nondum poenitentia, & nondum exomologesi facta, nondum manu iis ab Episcopo & Clero posita, Eucharistia illis datur, cum scriptum sit: Qui ederit panem aut biberit calicem Domini indigne, reus erit corporis & sanguinis Domini. Sed nunc illi rei non sunt, qui minus Scripturæ legem tenent; erunt autem rei, qui præsumunt, & hæc Fratribus non suggerunt, ut instructi a Præstitis faciant omnia cum Dei timore, & cum data ab eo & præscripta oblatione. Exponunt deinde invidiæ beatos Martyres, & gloriosos servos cum dei sacerdote committunt, ut cum illi memores loci nostri ad meras direxerint, & petierint tunc desideria sua examinari, & pacem dari, quando ipsa ante mater nostra Ecclesia pacem de misericordia Domini prior impensit, & nos divina Protectio reduces ad Ecclesiam suam fecerit; hilato honore quem nobis beati Martyres cum Confessoribus, servant, conpropta Domini lege & observatione, quam iidem Martyres & Confessores eandem mandant, ante extinctum Persecutionis metum, ante Reditum trum, ante ipsum pene Martyrum excessum, communicent cum lapsis & rant, & Eucharistiam tradant: Quando etiam si Martyres per Calorem Scripturam minus contemplantes, contra Legem Dei plus aliquid pererent, a Presbyteris & Diaconis suggerentibus admoneri deberent, sicut per in præteritum factum est. Castigare nos itaque Divina censura nec tibis desinit, nec diebus: Præter nocturnas enim visiones, per dies quæ, impletur apud nos Spiritu sancto puerorum innocens ætas, quæ in se videri oculis, & audit, & loquitur ea quibus nos Dominus monere & ruere dignatur. Et audietis omnia quando ad vos reducem me Dominus erit, qui ut secederem iussit. Interim temerarii & incauti & tumidi qui inter vos, qui hominem non cogitent, vel Deum timeant; scientes nam si ultra in isdem perseveraverint, utar ea admonitione, qua me Dominus jubet; ut interim prohibeantur offerre, acturi & apud nos, & Confessores ipsos, & apud Plebem universam causam suam; cum Domino permittente, in sinum Matris Ecclesiæ colligi cœperimus. De hoc Martyres & Confessores, & ad Plebem literas feci, quas utrasque vobis mandavi. Opto vos, Fratres carissimi ac desideratissimi in Domino bene valere, & nostri meminisse. Valet.

mean time they shall be prohibited to Offer, and shall be obliged afterward, to give Account of their Actions to himself, the Presbytery, the Confessors, and to the whole People.

But perhaps, Advantage may be taken of *Cyprian's* saying in this Epistle, *Ut interim prohibeantur offerre.* If *Cyprian* could suspend the disorderly Presbyters, or prohibite them to Offer, *that is*, to administer the Sacrament of the Eucharist, it cannot in Reason be denied, that he had a Negative Voice in the Church. In like manner, he sent Orders to the Presbytery and Church of *Carthage*, to Excommunicate any Presbyter or Deacon who durst presume to Communicate with the Lapsers before their Absolution: *Interea si quis immoderatus & præceps, sive de nostris Presbyteris vel Diaconibus, sive de peregrinis, ausus fuerit ante sententiam nostram communicare cum lapsis, a Communicatione nostra arceatur, apud omnes nos causam dicturus temeritatis suæ, quando in unum permittente Domino, convenerimus.* Wherefore, seing *Cyprian* had such a Power in his Diocess, could order the Presbytery to debarr from the Communion of the Church, any Presbyter, &c. who durst presume to Communicate with the Lapsers; it must be confess'd, that he had a greater Power than a Negative Voice in the Church would amount to. For Answer I say,

1. It cannot be pretended, that *Cyprian* exerted a Negative Voice, by his saying in this Epistle with respect to the disorderly Presbyters, *Ut interim prohibeantur Offerre*, that was but a threatning, that they should be prohibited to Offer, in case they persever'd in their disorderly Practices: *Scienti quoniam si ultra in iisdem perseveraverint, ut interim prohibeantur Offerre.* Whatever People may fancy, that these words, *Ut interim prohibeant Offerre*, do import, there is a great difference between the threatning of the Infliction of a Censu

or Punishment, and inflicting it actually. Wherefore I say, whatever these words may be made to signify, *Cyprian* did not exert a Negative Voice by this 16 Epistle, and consequently did not exert a Negative at all upon this Occasion. Yet there are some, who speak of *Cyprian's* exerting a Negative Voice, making use of his Tribunician Power, with as much assurance, as if the thing were capable of Demonstration, or were as clear as Noon-day. But these Men have but a very scurvy Trade of it, who make it their business to cast dust upon the Truth, or to obscure it, that they may deceive the People and lead them into Error, and make Disturbances or Schisms in the Church.

2. A Bishop in the 3. Century could not alone, or by his own Authority, Depose or Excommunicate either a Presbyter or Deacon. This is evident abundantly by many things in *Cyprian's* Epistles. *Cyprian* declares so much expressly and positively on several Occasions, *Quando a primordio Episcopatus mei statuerim, nihil sine consilio vestro, & consensu Plebis, mea privatim Sententia gerere.* And in Epistle 34. *Cui rei non potui me solum Judicem dare, cum multi adhuc de Clero absentes sint, & hæc singulorum tractanda sit & limanda plenius ratio, non tantum cum Collegis meis, sed & cum Plebe ipsa universa.* Not only so, but even a hundred Years after *Cyprian's* Time, a Bishop could not so much as Judge, or inflict any Censure whatsoever upon either a Presbyter or a Deacon, by his own Authority alone; This is evident to a Demonstration by several Canons of Councils, that are very positive and express with respect to this Head, which we will have occasion afterward to mention. The 23 Canon of a Council at Carthage, anno 398, which we have cited already, says, *Let the Bishop bear no Cause but in the presence of his Clergy, and the Sentences he shall give in the absence of his Clergy, shall be null and void.* Nay even in the 7, Century,

it was the Opinion of a whole Synod of Bishops, (to wit, 2 Coun. of *Sevil*) that it was not in the power of a Bishop to Depose, much less to Excommunicate, either a Presbyter or Deacon; for they Determine or Decree in their 6 Canon, *That a Bishop alone may indeed confer the Dignity of a Presbyter or Deacon, (that is, may Ordain them without the Concurrence of other Bishops) but he alone cannot take it away from them to whom he hath given it.* *Decrevimus ut juxta priscorum Patrum Synodalem Sententiam, nullus nostrum, sine Concilii examine, DEſICE-RE QUEMLIBET PRESBYTERUM VEL DIACONUM AUDEAT.* *Episcopus enim Sacerdotibus ac Ministris solus honorem dare potest, auferre solus non potest. Si enim hi qui in seculo a Dominis suis libertatis honorem adepti sunt, in servitutis nexum non revolvuntur, nisi publice apud Prætores, tribunali foro fuerint accusari: Quanto magis hi qui divinis altaribus consecrati, honore Ecclesiastico decorantur? Qui profecto NEC AB UNO DAMNARI, NEC, UNO JUDICANTE, POTERUNT HONORIS SUI PRIVILEGIIS EXUL: Sed præsentati Synodali Judicio, quod Canon de illis præceperit definiri.* These are the very words of this Synod in their 6. Canon, And seing a Bishop could not depose a Presbyter or a Deacon in the 7. Century, he must be very ignorant who thinks, that he could by his own Authority, Depose or Excommunicate either of them in the 3. Century.

3. A Presbytery and Church in the 3. Century, could by their own Authority, without their Bishop, Depose or Excommunicate either a Deacon or a Presbyter. Thus the Presbytery and Church of *Carthage* Excommunicated the Presbyter of *Didida* and his Deacon, without the concurrence of *Cyprian*; yea, so far was *Cyprian* from concurring with them in that Action, that he knew nothing of it at all till they sent him word, that they had done it. And when they did this without the Authoritative Con-

currence of their Bishop, they did not take upon them more than they should have done, they went not beyond the Limits of the Power that was competent to a Presbytery and Church; they did not injure their Bishop *Cyprian*, or incroach upon any Prerogative belonging to him, or pretended to by him. And when they inform'd *Cyprian* of what they had done, he did not condemn them, because they did it without his Permission or Orders, he did not accuse them either of Presumption or Rebellion; he did not quarrel them that they exerted a Power not belonging to them; he did not complain, that the Presbyters were unmindful of their Station and Place; or that they did not reserve to him the Honour of his Chair and Priesthood, as he did on another Occasion: In a word, he did not signify that he was displeas'd any manner of way, as if they had put any slight upon him. On the contrary, as soon as he got notice of what they had done, he commended them highly for it, he prais'd their Integrity, and said, That they acted honestly, and according to the Laws of Discipline. *Integre, faith he, & cum disciplina fecistis, Fratres charissimi, quod consilio Collegarum meorum qui presentes erant, Gaio Diddensi Presbytero & Diacono ejus censuistis non communicandum, Ep. 34.* But may be, all this was of *Cyprian's* Gentleness, and the easiness of his Nature, and must be attributed to his *Voluntary Condescension*; perhaps the other Bishops were offended at the Presbytery of *Carthage*, and judged that they exerted a Power not competent to them. Not at all. So far was this from being true, that the Bishops, who were present at *Carthage* at the time, advised them to do what they did. *Quod consilio Collegarum meorum qui presentes erant, &c.* Wherefore, I say in the

4. place, That if *Cyprian* sent Orders to the Presbytery and Church of *Carthage*, to Excommunicate any

Presbyter or Deacon who should Communicate with the Lapsers before their Absolution, he sent such Orders as *Themistocles* did, when he sent Orders to the Common-W. or Magistrates of *Athens*, to apprehend the *Lacedemonian* Ambassadors, and detain them as Prisoners until he should return home in Safety. The Business was this, The *Lacedemonians* sent word to the *Athenians*, that they would not permit them to build up the Walls of their City, which they had begun already to do; *Themistocles* advises them to go on with the Building with all Diligence, notwithstanding this Message from *Lacedæmon*, and withal, to send himself to *Lacedæmon* together with some others as Ambassadors, to excuse the Thing. When *Themistocles* came to *Lacedæmon*, he delay'd as long as he could to appear before the Magistrates there and to deliver his Commission, sometimes pretending one Excuse, sometimes another, delaying on purpose, that the *Athenians* might have time to raise the Walls to a just height. When severals from other places came and inform'd at *Sparta*, That the *Athenians* were still carrying on the Work with great speed, so that the Walls were already very high: *Themistocles* appear'd at length, and with great impudence denied Matter of Fact, telling the *Lacedæmonians*, That they should not give credit to every body who came with News to them, but should send some of their own Number Ambassadors to *Athens*, that they might be Eye-witnesses, and bring a certain Account of things which they might depend upon. *Themistocles* sent word to *Athens* privately, that the Ambassadors were coming, and ordered the *Athenians* to seize upon them as soon as they should arrive, and keep them Prisoners till he and they who were with him came safely back, being afraid lest the *Lacedæmonians* upon the Return of their Ambassadors, should detain him as Prisoner, and punish him for putting such a Trick upon them. *Themistocles*,

cles denied the Fact, says Plutarch *, bidding them to send to Athens to see whether it were so or no; by which Delay, he got time for the building of the Wall; and ordering the Athenians to seize upon those who were sent, and keep them as Hostages for him. And says Thucydides, Themistocles sent word privately, That the Lacedæmonian Ambassadors were coming, and ordered the Athenians to detain them with as little noise as they could, and not to let them go, till he and they who were with him returned. Καὶ περὶ αὐτῶν ὁ Θερμιστοκλῆς τοῖς Ἀθηναίοις κρύφα πέμπει κελδίων ὡς ἦκιστα ἐπιφανέως καταχεῖν, καὶ μὴ ἀρεῖναι πρὶν ἀναυτοὶ πάλιν ἰομεῖσθαι. The Government of Athens was Democratical, wherefore it is easy to understand, what the nature was of these Orders, Themistocles sent to the Republick from Sparta. And I say, that the Orders which Cyprian sent to the Presbytery and Church of Carthage, were of the same Nature; that is plainly, the Orders he sent amounted to no more but Counsel. - Cyprian did not pretend to send Royal Edicts or Imperial Commands to Carthage, only he advised the Presbytery there to do so and so. And this is further evident from Cyprian's next words in the very same Epistle, *Desiderasti quoque ut de Philumeno & Fortunato Hypodiatonis & Favorino Acolytho, ut medio tempore recesserunt, & nunc venerunt quid mihi videatur rescribam, cui rei non potui me solum iudicem dare, &c.* The Presbytery desired his advice only with respect to Fortunatus and Philumenus, *Ut quid mihi videatur rescribam*, not that he should send Commands as a King. And he sends them word, that he being alone where he was, could not take upon him to send positive Advice to them in the Affair, it being of Consequence, *non potui me solum Iudicem dare, &c.*

§. And more particularly, with respect to Cyprian's saying in this Epistle, *Ut interim prohibeantur* of.

* Plut. in Life of Th. Vol. I. Engl. Ed. Anno 1700.

Offerre. This prohibiting the disorderly Presbyters to offer or administer the Sacrament, doth not imply a deposing them, nay nor a suspending them from the Exercise of the Functions of their Office, or a debarring them from sitting or acting as Ruling-Elders in the Presbytery. It must be remembred, that the Bishop and his Presbyters had but one single Congregation in Charge among them all; and seing the Bishop was the Pastour, the Presbyters could have no access or power to Preach and Administer the Sacraments in his Diocess or Congregation, but when he thought fit to imploy them (as none can preach or administer Sacraments in a Congregation in *Scotland* now, but they who are imploy'd by the Minister of that Congregation) wherefore *Cyprian's* saying, *Ut interim prohibeantur Offerre*, will import no more but this, That *Cyprian* who was the Pastour, would put this Task upon the disorderly Presbyters, That he would not permit or allow them to preach in his Pulpit, or to administer Sacraments in his Congregation, but would imploy the other Presbyters only in that Work. If there were 7 or 8 Ruling-Elders in a Congregation in *Scotland*, licensed Preachers all of them, the Pastour or Minister could imploy or not imploy any of them to Preach in his Congregation as he thought fit, and if they were impower'd to administer Sacraments, he could do the same. I say,

6. Tho we should *Voluntarily condescend*, or grant by way of Compliment to our Prelatical Friends, that *Cyprian's* saying, *Ut interim prohibeantur Offerre* implieth, That he exerted a Negative Voice by this Epistle, or did something equivalent, it would do the Party no service: All the Inference they could make would be this, That a Bishop may exert a Negative Voice, when he is appointed to do it by immediate Revelation from GOD. For *Cyprian* you see pretended to immediate Revelation from him

hindering the disorderly Presbyters to Offer, he speaks of Nocturnal Visions, and Warnings by inspir'd Children, and says he, *Qui hominem non metuant vel Deum timeant, and Utare admonitione quam uti Dominus jubet*. If any particular Minister in Scotland, Presbyterian or Episcopal can instruct, that he has immediate Revelation for it, he may exert a Negative Voice in the General-Assembly, and they would be beasts that would pretend to hinder them. It is notoriously evident then, that *Cyprian* exerted not a Negative Voice by his 16 Epistle, and consequently that he did not exert it at all upon this Occasion.

But that if it be possible, it may appear yet more evidently, that *Cyprian* neither did nor pretended to put forth or exert a Negative Voice upon this Occasion, I desire that the following Particulars may be attentively considered.

1. If he exerted a Negative Voice by Epistle 16, he did it very impertinently, and his Conduct was ridiculous; for he speaks nothing at all of his Negative Voice, and offers not in that Epistle to interpose therewith, but threatens, that the disorderly Presbyters should in due time be call'd to an Account of their Proceedings, by himself, the Presbytery, and whole Church: Whereas, it was time enough to threaten, after he had put a Legal Stop to their Procedure by his Negative Voice, and after they had slighted it, or continued to Communicate with, or receive the Lapsers, notwithstanding thereof. For, what did he know but they would have desisted, if he had interpos'd with his Negative in a legal, or if you please, a Canonical way? And if they had, they would have acted according to the Method of Discipline, and *Cyprian* would have had no Reason to complain. But supposing that he was exerting no Negative Voice, and pretending to no such Prerogative, his threatening that they should
be

be obliged to give Account to himself, to the Presbytery and Church, and be prohibited in the mean time to Offer, was very rational and pertinent.

2. If it be suppos'd, that *Cyprian* made use of a Negative Voice by his 16 Epistle, and that the disorderly Presbyters slighted it, (for they did urge the receiving of the Lapsed after that) the other Presbyters who join'd with him, and were Enemies to, and oppos'd the Proceedings of the disorderly ones, would not have fail'd to send word to him immediately, and inform him of the illegal and rebellious Proceedings of these Presbyters, or their acting contrary to the Authority of his Negative Voice. But so it is, that they sent no word at all to *Cyprian* after they had received his 16 Epistle, and had no thoughts of writing to him, till he forced them in a manner by Complaints, and importunate Intreaties, as is evident from Epistle 18. And one would think, that *Cyprian* would have been very inquisitive anent the Success of his Negative Voice which he had passed, desirous to know what Influence it had in the Presbytery, and whether the disorderly Presbyters had due regard thereto or not. But behold, the very next time he writ to the Presbytery or in his 18 Epistle, he does not touch the Affair directly or indirectly, makes no Enquiry at all anent the Success his Negative had, and does not at all desire, that the Presbytery might send any word to him about it. This was very strange, if *Cyprian* did exert a Negative, as is pretended.

3. When the Presbytery was at length prevail'd upon to write to *Cyprian* and to inform him about the state of Affairs at *Carthage*, it might have been expected, that they would have said something with respect to this Affair, either that the disorderly Presbyters rebell'd against his Negative Voice, or acted as if he had not interpos'd therewith, or that due Obedience was given thereto. But they writ

nothing about it directly or indirectly, as is evident from *Cyprian's* Answer to them, Ep. 19; it did not enter into their thoughts to inform *Cyprian* whether the said Presbyters regarded his Negative Voice or disregarded it, submitted to it, or trampled upon it. At least it might have been expected, that *Cyprian* would have complain'd mightily in his 19 Epistle, or reproved them sharply for neglecting to give him notice about an Affair of such importance, and which did so nearly concern his Episcopal Sovereignty. But *Cyprian* writes nothing to this purpose at all. This was odd, or rather mad Conduct, if *Cyprian* exerted a Negative Voice by his 16 Epistle. The Presbytery did indeed send word to *Cyprian*, that their wholesome Counsels were not wanting, That they advised that the Lapsers might not be received too hastily, and that notwithstanding their Advices, it was still urged that they might be received immediately; and desir'd a Form from *Cyprian*, or Advice how they should carry with respect to that Affair. And *Cyprian* sent them word, that these of the Lapsers who were sick and in danger of death, and were recommended by the Martyrs, might be received immediately; but as to the rest, that their Reception might be delay'd. But neither did the Presbytery send word to *Cyprian*, that they advised Compliance with his Negative Voice; neither did he complain of their neglecting to advise such Compliance; and neither did he or they ever mind that Affair again, or touch it directly or indirectly in any Epistle. It is ridiculous then to suppose, that *Cyprian* exerted a Negative Voice by his 16 Epistle.

4. In the 27. Epistle, which is directed to the Presbytery of *Rome*, after *Cyprian* had given them Account of the Impertinencies of the Martyr *Lucianus*, he tells them, That their Letter to the Clergy came in very good season, and was not a

little helpful to him : *Laborantes hic nos, & contra invidia impetum totis fidei viribus resistentes, multum sermo vester adjuvit, &c.* But gives them no Account either of the Rebellion of the disorderly Presbyters against his Negative Voice, or the Influence their Letter had toward the making them comply therewith ; which is so much the more strange, that he used to send them word about the smallest Occurrences : Thus he says to them in Epistle 35. *Et dilectio communis, & ratio exposcit, Fratres charissimi, nihil conscientia vestra subtrahere de his quæ apud nos geruntur, &c.* If Cyprian had exerted a Negative Voice by his 16 Epistle, and the disorderly Presbyters had rebelled against it, and trampled on the Authority thereof, he could not have missed to send word to the Presbytery of Rome about it, either in Epistle 20, in which he says to them, *Quoniam comperi, Fratres charissimi, minus simpliciter & minus fideliter vobis renunciari, quæ hic a nobis & gesta sunt & geruntur, necessarium duxi hæc ad vos literas facere, quibus vobis actus nostri, & Disciplina, & diligentia ratio redderetur :* Or in this 27 Epistle, wherein he tells them, *Post factas ad vos literas, Fratres charissimi, quibus actus noster expositus, & disciplina ac diligentia quantulacunque ratio declarata est, aliud accessit, quod nec ipsum latere vos debuit ;* and would have desired their Advice, or craved their Assistance about it : And it cannot be doubted, that the Roman Presbyters would have written to Cyprian anent the Affair, or to the Carthaginian Presbytery, condemning the Temerity and Rebellion of their disorderly Members, or their destroying the Method of Discipline, by refusing to Cyprian that Prerogative which all the other Bishops in the World were in peaceable possession of, and which did belong to the Episcopal Office from the beginning. But it never came into Cyprian's head to send any such word to the Roman Presbyters, and they write no Letter relating to
this

this Affair either to Cyprian himself, or to the Carthaginian Presbytery.

5. The Roman Presbyters in their Answer (Ep. 30) tell Cyprian, That they declar'd their Opinion very freely both, *Adversus eos qui seipsos infideles illicita nefariorum libellorum professione prodiderant, &c.* And likewise, *Adversus illos qui accepta fecissent, licet presentes cum fuerent non affuissent, cum presentiam suam utique ut sic scriberentur, mandando fecissent.* And, *Contra illos quoque qui illicitis sacrificiis manus suas atque ora polluerant, &c.* And may we not think it odd, that they never thought of telling him among other Compliments, that they testified their abhorrence of the Rebellion of the disorderly Presbyters; and their unlawful and unaccountable Procedure, contrary to the Authority of his Negative Voice, if ever such a thing had been?

6. In Epistle 31. which is from the Roman Confessors to Cyprian, after these Confessors had commended him highly, for his Faithfulness and Diligence in his Office, they add, *Sed quod nos ad majorem latitiam robustius provocavit, tacere non possumus, quin omnis vocis nostræ testimonio prosequamur. Animadvertimus enim te congruente censure, & eos digne objurgasse, qui immemores delictorum suorum, pacem a Presbyteris per absentiam tuam festinata & præcipiti cupiditate extorsissent, & illos qui sine respectu Evangelii sanctum domini canibus, & Margaritas porcis, profana facilitate donassent, &c.* Here you see they commend Cyprian greatly, for his chiding and reproving the disorderly Presbyters, because of their admitting the Lapsed to the Table of the Lord, and the Lapsed themselves for their Precipitancy and too great haste. And if Cyprian had exerted a Negative Voice, whether by Epistle 16 or any other, what probability is there, that they would have neglected to mention such a thing, or to give him due Praises for such a Piece of Service? There

is no Ground at all to think, that they did understand his exerting a Negative Voice by the *Conveniente Censura* they speak of: For who knows not that *Censura* signifies *Reproof*? And does not the word *Objurgasse* determine it to this sense here? And if any will without probation, have these words to import, That *Cyprian* inflicted some Censure on the disorderly Presbyters, how will they prove, that the Censure was his opposing them by a Negative Voice? Nay, they could not understand hereby his opposing them by exerting a Negative Voice: For to inflict a Censure is one thing, and to exert a Negative Voice is another; the *Tribunes* did not inflict a Censure on the Senate, when they interpos'd by Intercession; nor does the King on the Parliament, when he refuses his Assent to an Act. Then *Cyprian* Censured the Lapsers who violently extorted Peace from the Presbyters, the same way he censur'd the disorderly Presbyters, who did cast the Pearls before Swine: But he Censured the Lapsers no way but by Reproofs, and his chiding them in his Letters. *Ergo, &c.*

7. *Cyprian* in Ep. 34. directed to his Presbyters and Deacons, complains not, that the disorderly Presbyters trampled on his Negative Voice, hinder'd it to take effect, or acted contrary thereto; but only that his *Salubria & vera Consilia nihil promovent, dum blanditiis & palpationibus perniciosis veritas impeditur, & patitur lapsorum saucia & agra mens.* &c. It is very strange, that *Cyprian* should call his Negative Voice *Salubria nostra & vera consilia*.

8. In Epistle 35. *Cyprian* giving Account to the Presbytery of *Rome*, that some of the Lapsers refused to enter into a state of Penance, pretending that they were already received to the Peace of the Church, through the means of the Martyr *Paulus* says, *Quod si ultra temeritas eorum nec meus nec vestri literis compressa fuerit, nec consiliis salutaribus obtempe-*

raverit, agemus ea quæ secundum Evangelium Dominus agere præcipit. Why does he not say, *If they be not restrain'd by a Negative Voice*, or Absolute Episcopal Sovereignty? Or if he had a Negative Voice, how comes he to suppose, That an Epistle from the Presbytery of *Rome* might prove as effectual towards the restraining them, as his own Letter?

9. In Epistle 36, the *Roman Presbyters* Answer *Cyprian*, and tell him, *Tu tamen Frater nunquam pro tua charitate desistas lapsorum animos temperare & errantibus præstare medicinam veritatis, &c.* Is't not a wonder, that they advise him not here to restrain them by exerting his Negative Voice? but you see, they directed him to Methods quite different, and if they knew that he had a Negative Voice in his Church, they were guilty of a very strange Oversight when they added, *Quod spatio productioris temporis impetu isto consensiente*, this looks not like their being Conscious, that *Cyprian* had the Privilege of a Negative Voice in his Church. I'm afraid they will be forced to have recourse to *Voluntary condescension* here.

10. In Epistle 43, which is directed to the Church of *Carthage*, *Cyprian* speaking of this Deed of the disorderly Presbyters, or their admitting the Lapsers contrary to the Discipline of the Church, calls it a Rebellion, not against his Negative Voice, (which he would not have fail'd to have done, if ever he had exerted any on this Occasion) but a Rebellion against the Resolutions of the Church of *Carthage*, the Confessors, of the Presbytery of *Rome*, and of all the Bishops of *Africa*, and beyond Seas. *Cumque semel placuerit*, says he, *tam nobis quam Confessoribus, & Clericis urbicu, item universis Episcopis vel in nostro Provincia, † vel trans mare consti-*

† It is ridiculous to conclude, that *Cyprian* was Metropolitan, because he speaks of *Episcopis* in *Provincia nostra constitutis*. What more ordinary than

stitutis, ut nihil innovetur circa lapsorum causam, nisi omnes in unum convenerimus, & collatis consiliis cum disciplina pariter & misericordia, temperatam sententiam fixerimus; contra hoc Consilium nostrum rebelletur, & omnis Sacerdotalis Autoritas & Potestas, factiosis conspirationibus destruat.

11. Cyprian in Epistle 59. directed to Cornelius Bishop of Rome, gives him a punctual Account of the Crimes of these Presbyters, and their impious Behaviour with respect to the Lapsers; *Quod a primo statim persecutionis die, cum recentia delinquentium facinora ferverent, & sacrificiis nefandis non tantum Diaboli altaria, sed adhuc manus ipsæ lapsorum atque ora fumarent, communicare cum lapsis & pœnitentiæ agendæ intercedere non destiterunt:* And he says a little after, *Nos in ipso persecutionis tempore de hoc ipso literas misimus, nec auditi sumus.* Pray, why did he not inform Cornelius, that he interpos'd with his Negative Voice on that Occasion, and that they rebell'd against the Authority thereof; if he did such a thing, and they were guilty of such Rebellion? In a word, let any person read the Epistles that were written either by or to Cyprian during his Retirement, in which there is any Occasion to speak of the disorderly Admission of the Lapsers, and he will find no mention at all of Cyprian's Negative Voice, either of his actual exerting it, or of his having a Right to do it; but will find something in almost all these Epistles from whence it may be concluded, either that he exerted no Negative Voice on that Occasion, or that he had no Power or Right to do it. And I think no more needs to be said to make it appear, that Cyprian exerted no Negative Voice

than for an Inhabitant to call the Town in which he lives *Our Town*, or private Person to call the Army *Our Army*, in like manner, Cyprian might call the Nation or Province in which he lived *Nostra Provincia*, tho he had no Authority over it as Metropolitan. In a word, we have no Reason all to think, that there were any such Creatures as Metropolitans in the days of Cyprian.

Voice against the disorderly Presbyters, and that he had no such Prerogative in his Church.

Yet there are several things in *Cyprian's* Epistles which the Prelatists build upon, and from which they bring Arguments not a few to prove, that the Bishop had not only a Negative Voice in his Church in the 3 Century, but even Absolute Power. We intend now to consider these Arguments, as they are collected and set down by the Learn'd J. S. in the 5, 6, and 7 Chapters of his *Vindic. Prin. Cyprian. Age.*

C H A P. IV.

The Arguments of the Prelatists, from Terms and Phrases in Cyprian's Works or elsewhere, or from the Episcopal Prerogatives, prove not, that the Bishop had either Absolute Power, or a Negative Voice, in the 3d. Century.

IN the first place, the Arguments he proposes Chap. 5. from § 10, to 32, are not to the purpose. Will any conclude, That because *Honour, Dignity, Authority, † and Power*, are attributed to the Bishop in *Cyprian's* Epistles; or because in them the Bishop is said, *To undertake the Episcopal Office, to hold it, claim it, &c.* that therefore he had in those days, a Negative Voice in the Presbytery? As little to the Purpose are his Arguments, Chap. 6. taken from the *Episcopal place, Degree, Chair, &c.*

† *Objurgavi Senatum, ut mihi visus sum, summa cum Autoritate, & in usa non verecunda admodum gravis & copiosus fui. Cicer. ad Astic. lib. 4. p. 17.* Yet I suppose, *Cicero* was but a Senator at the time.

Sc. (a) the high Top of the Priesthood, Pastour in chief, (b) their being the Apostles Successours, promoted by singular Succession, Vicarious Ordination, their being a College distinct from the Presbyters, or the like. It can never I say, be proven by these or such things, that the Bishop had a Negative in the Church then, and if that be not proven nothing is proven; for as has been said, if the Bishops in Cyprian's time were every one of them Pastours of one Congregation only, and had no Negative in their Churches, they were but such Bishops as our Presbyterian Bishops.

How easy is it to perceive, that it can never be proven the Bishop had a Negative in that Age, from such Things, Prerogatives, or call them what you will? The Duke of Venice is Stil'd, Prince of the Common-w. Baptista Nani says of Antonio Donato, That among his Ancestours were Persons of great Integrity, such as Leonardo Donato, PRINCE OF THE REPUBLICK. Hist. de Ven. T. 2. l. 4. and T. 1. l. 2. And that Duke Marco Antonio Memo being dead, Joanni Bembo was rais'd to the Supreme Dignity of the Common-w. This Duke has Dignity, Honour and Power attributed to him, has his Cathedra, sits upon a Throne, gives Audience to Ambassadors, and the Acts of the Senate run in his Name (and thus the

Acts

(c) The Bishop's Chair was call'd a Throne, but that implies not he had Sovereignty; for the Chairs in which the Masters of Rhetorick or Philosophy did Teach, were call'd Thrones, both at Athens and Rome. Thus Perizonius in his Preface to the History of Elian. Potissimum tamen illi qui Rhetoricam publica Autoritate docebant. Quod apud Græcos, imprimis Atheniense, honestum valde & gloriosum esse, cepit tempore Romanorum Cæsarium: et id ad id munus etiam alienigenæ præbcebantur, qui tunc dicebantur nati Thronum Atheniensem cui *ἱερόν* præfuit, primus tempore Adriani Lollium Epheusius. Deinde alii etiam per ipsos Cæsares hunc Thronum fuerunt consecuti. Veluti Pollux per Commodum, & Ptiliscus per Antoninum Caracallum. Simili autem erat Sophistarum Thronus etiam in Urbe Rōmā, ut patet ex vita Eudiani. So that the Throne implies, that the Bishops were the publick Teachers. or what we call Pastours of the Churches.

(d) The Bishop is no where call'd Pastour in Chief in Cyprian, or Supreme Pastour, but only the Pastour; neither are the Presbyters call'd inferior subordinate Pastours that I can mind; its true, they and the Deacons together are sometimes call'd Pastours, but then they are call'd so improperly, if it, they were not, Pastours at all.

Acts of the Presbytery did run in the Bishop's Name, he being Moderator, and the principal Officer of the Church; so that *the Bishop did such a thing*, is as much as to say, *That the Church or Presbytery did such a thing*; even as *the Duke appoints or ordains*, must be interpreted, *the Senate ordains.*) This Duke has his *Locus* and *Gradus* to which he is promoted by *singular Succession*: And if there were such other Republicks in *Italy* as *Venice*, no doubt their Dukes might be considered as a *College* by themselves. But if any should pretend to infer from all this, That the Duke of *Venice* has Absolute Power or even a Negative Voice, he would be reckon'd a very ridiculous Person.

Moreover, all these things are applicable to Congregational Bishops, they have their *Cathedra*, *Locus* and *Gradus* above the Presbyters (or Ruling-Elders) they are raised to the *High Top of the Priesthood*, are promoted by *singular Succession*, succeed the *Apostles* by *Vicarious Ordination*, and that in the *Supreme Power Ecclesiastical*; and all the *substantial Episcopal Prerogatives* mentioned by *J. S.* belong to them: And for my part, I know no Title *J. S.*'s sort of Bishops have to these Prerogatives, and he has not yet attempted to make it appear by any Argument that they have, and I'm sure he will never be able to make this appear.

He makes much noise with the Phrase *Limare consilium* *; but after all, he would have been as
A a wise

* *J. S.* says, *Consilium* sometimes signifies Authority or Power in *Cyprian's* Epistles; tho' that were true, it will not follow, that it has that signification when *Limare* is join'd with it. *Canis* signifies a living Creature they call a Dog, but when *Caestis* is join'd with it, it has quite another Signification. Thus he tells us, page 393, that *Suffragium* is sometimes taken for something else than *Elective Voice*: But what then? he should have proven that *Suffragium Populi* does not alwise signify the *People's Elective Voice*: And tho' he had done this, as he has not and cannot, he had done nothing unless he made it appear, that when it is said, An Office is devolved upon a Person *Suffragio Populi*, even then it is taken for some other thing than *Elective Voice of the People*, in approved Authors; for *Cyprian* says, *Ut de huiusmodi Episcopatus suffragio Episcopatus ei deferretur: ut Suffragium Populi*
1 m

wife if he had yielded it to G. R. it being ridiculous to pretend, that this Phrase signifies to Command or give forth Orders as a Prince. *Cui rei*, says Cyprian, Epistle 34, *non potui me solum Iudicem dare, cum hæc singulorum tractanda sit, & limanda plentius ratio, non tantum cum Collegis (i. e. Episcopis) sed & cum Plebe ipsa universa.* Is this to give Orders as a Prince to his Colleagues the Bishops, or Synod, and to the People? Is not the meaning plainly this, That he could not take it upon himself alone to give positive Advice as to that Affair, seeing it was necessary, it should be treated of, and more fully adjusted not only with the Bishops, but with the People themselves. And are not *Limare consilium*, and *Limare rationem*, Phrases of the same import?

But *J. S.* proves, that *Limare consilium* in that place, is to give Orders, by what is said after. The Causes of the rest of the Lapsers, says Cyprian there, I did plainly command (*mandavi*) to be delay'd till I my self might be present. To command plainly or peremptorily, says *J. S.* is to give Orders with a Witness. Is it not now very evident, that *Limare consilium* is to give Orders? But hold a little.

Notwithstanding all this clear Probation, we have still some Reason to doubt: For *Mandare* very ordinarily and currantly signifyeth no more but to

ad-

implies no more but their Good-liking, as says *J. S.* how could it be said, an Office was devolved on a Man *de eorum Suffragio*? At this rate it might be said, the Kingly Office was devolved on a Person, by the Suffrages of two or three Footmen, because when the Parliament elected him, he had the good-liking of the Footmen. Thus Nazianzen says (Orat. 21) of Athanasius,

Ἰὼω τῷ λαῷ παντὸς ἐπὶ τὸν Μάρκον ὑπόβον ἀναγεται. If the People's Suffrages here signifie no more, but that Athanasius had the Approbation or good-liking of the People of Alexandria after he was elected by the Bishops, how could it be said, That he was set upon the Throne of Mark by their Suffrages? Then the Act of the People in constituting their Bishops, is frequently in Cyprian and elsewhere expressed by the word *Eligere*. Thus Ambrose, *Merito vir tantus evasit quoniam omnis elegit Ecclesia*. Wherefore it lies upon *J. S.* to prove, That when the People are said to Elect their Officers whether Civil or Ecclesiastical, *Eligere* implies no more but the People's approving them after they are already chosen by others.

advertise, send, or send word †. Thus *Cesar, Hæc cum in Achaia atque apud Dyrrachium gererentur, Scipionemque in Macedoniam venisse constaret; non oblitus pristini instituti Cesar, mittit ad eum Clodium, & huic dat literas MANDATAQUE ad eum, and a little after, Hæc ad eum MANDATA Clodius refert, De Bel. civ. l. 3. that is, While these things were a-doing in Achaia, and at Dyrrachium, and when it was certain that Scipio was come to Macedonia, Cesar not forgetting his former Purpose, sent Clodius to him, with Letters and Proposals, or Word: Not Orders and Commands. For this was before the Battel of Pharsalia, when Scipio Pompey's Father-in-law, and a General, was in equal Terms with Cesar, neither was he ever subject to him. Thus (that we may repay F. S. honestly, and give him Verses for Verses here) *Virg. Æn. l. 3.**

*Hunc Polydorum auri quondam cum pondere magno
Infelix Priamus furtim Mandarat alendum
Threicio Regi.*

Mandar, i. e. did send. Neither is F. S. ignorant of this; for he himself very pertinently renders *Mandare*, to desire, *Vind. prin. Cyp. Age. p. 423, 424.*

But Cyprian says not only *Mandavi*, but *Autorem me constitui*, made my self Author in this Business.

Neither doth this help the Matter, *Author* here is a *Perswader*, thus *Virg. Geor. l. 2.*

*Nec tibi tam prudens quisquam persuadeat Author
Tellurem Boreâ rigidam spirante movere. i. e.*

Let no Person, pretending to be a prudent Adviser, perswade you to plow while the North-wind bloweth.

A a 2

F. S.

† Thus Cicero to Atticus, *lib. 5. Ep. 5.* Plane deest quod scribam, nec quod *Mandem* habeo. Postea vero Urbanus & Sidonius Confessores ad Presbyteros nostros venerunt, affirmantes Maximum Confessorem, & Presbyterum secum pariter cupere in Ecclesiam redire: Sed quoniam multa præcesserant ab iis designata, quæ tu quoque a Coepiscopis nostris & literis meis cognovisti, ut non temere eis fides haberetur, ex ipsorum Ore & Confessione, ista quæ per legationem *Mandaverant*, placuit audiri. *Cyp. Ep. 49. p. 92.*

J. S. has further to add, That *Cyprian* says *Legem dedi **, and if this do not the Job, I'm afraid he will be put to new Shifts with it. But every body knows, that *Cyprian* being a Bishop, was a Spiritual Father, and might give Laws as Fathers or Mothers use to do. *My Son hear the Instruction of thy Father,* says *Solomon*, and forsake not the Law of thy Mother. That is, Instruction, Direction or Advice.

Again says J. S. the Presbytery desired a Form from *Cyprian*, i. e. says he, his will and pleasure, his Orders to be their Rule. But this says nothing to the Episcopal Sovereignty: For the Martyrs, who could only *Petition*, sent a Form to *Cyprian* and the other Bishops; *Et hanc Formam*, say they to *Cyprian*, *per te & alios Episcopos innotescere volumus*, i. e. Our desire is, that this our Form be made known by you, to the other Bishops.

J. S.'s Answer is very ready here. *Cyprian* says he, and the rest of the Bishops were highly offended at the Martyrs for thus taking upon them to command and give out Orders, and their Orders were not obey'd.

And say I, These are J. S.'s Dreams. It never enter'd into *Cyprian*'s head to be displeas'd at the Martyrs for their taking upon them to Command. He was indeed offended at them on account of the iniquity of the thing, or injustice of their Desires, as he had reason; but not because they did take on them to give Orders as Princes. Neither *Cyprian* nor they did ever think of any such thing. *Fecerunt ad nos de quibusdam*, says *Cyprian*, Ep. 17. *beati Martyres literas, petentes examinati desideria sua*, i.

* *Sunt quibus in Satyra videar nimis acer, & Ultra*

Legem tendere opus:

Horat. Serm. lib. 2. Sat. 1. i. e. beyond the Rule, or Method, or Custom and Manner of handling or writing Satyres. Thus, *Nec temere in hoc Legem dedi*, says *Cyprian*, i. e. Neither did I give you this Rule, or direct you to this Method rashly or without Reason.

Quam temere in nosvet Legem sancimus iniquam.

i. e. Iniquas condiciones subimus. Idem, Serm. 1. 1. Sat. 3.

The blessed Martyrs write to us concerning some, *Petitioning* that their *Desires* might be consider'd. The *Form* then which they sent to *Cyprian*, was but a *Petition*, they were not such Idiots as to pretend to Command the Bishops, or to give Orders like Sovereign Lords or Kings. They intended nothing you see, but to intreat *Cyprian* to consent to what they desir'd, in a *Stile* not usual now indeed, but which was ordinary and well enough understood in their day.

Afterward he is at much pains to prove, that the *Cyprianick* Bishop had *Licentia*, the Sovereign Power of the Sacraments. The Presbyterian Bishops have more, even the *sole* Power of the Sacraments; their Presbyters or Elders Administer them in no case.

As to the Episcopal *Actus*, *Vigor*, *Disciplina*, *Liberum Arbitrium*, &c. the Bishop must be consider'd as the Church's Representative, in many places in which these words occur; so that the Bishop's *Actus* and *Vigor*, &c. signifies the Church's *Actus* and *Vigor*, &c. The Unity of the Catholick Church, says *Cyprian*, may be very well preserved, tho every Bishop within his own District be Master of his own *Actus* or Administration, and accountable to GOD alone †. That is, Tho every Church be Master of their own Affairs. The Episcopal *Actus* is not the Bishop's but the Church's *Actus*, if *Actus* be taken for the Supreme Ecclesiastical Governing Power: Thus Ep. 33. p. 6. *Et omnis Ecclesiæ Actus per eosdem Præpositos gubernetur*: So that the Episcopal *Actus* is the Church's *Actus*, which is moderated and guided by the Bishop. Thus Ep. 3. *Cum pro Episcopatus Vigore & Cathedræ auctoritate haberes potestatem qua posses de illo statim indicari. i. e.* You and the Presbytery or Church, have Authority and full Power, to chastise the rebellious.

† Manente Concordiæ vinculo, & perseverante Catholice Ecclesiæ indivisum sacramento, alium suum dispenit & dirigit unusquisque Episcopus, rationem posite sui Domino redditurus. Ep. 55. p. 110.

bellious Deacon, and might have deposed him if you had found Cause. And to the same purpose Ep. 14. *Et iccirco consulte & cum vigore fecisti, Frater charissime, abstinendo Diaconum, &c.* So that the Episcopal Vigour by which a rebellious Presbyter or Deacon was depos'd, or Excommunicated, was the Church's Vigour; Ep. 30. *Abstinent enim ab Ecclesia Romana Vigorem suum tam profana facilitate dimittere, & nervos severitatis eversa fidei Majestate dissolvere* †.

That

† Sometimes these words must be taken in another sense, as in Epistle 20. *Nec spiritu nec actu, nec monitis meis defui.* And *necessarium duxi* be ad vos *litteras facere, quibus vobis actus nostri, & Disciplina, & aigentia* &c. *remitteretur.* And in Epistle 67. *Et Episcopus delegatur* &c. *presente, qui singulorum vitam plenissime novit, & uniuscujusque actum de ejus conversatione perspicit.* The same may be said of the word *Vigor.* Cyprian says of a Letter that was writ by the Presbytery of Rome to the Clergy of Carthage: *Opportune vero si pervenerunt littere vestrae ad Clerum facta in quibus Evangelii plenus vigor, & disciplina robusta legis Dominice continentur* Epistle 27.

Cyprian says in Epistle 20, That he made the disorderly Presbyters find the dint of his Episcopal or Sacerdotal Vigour, and he made them find the dint of his Episcopal Vigour no other way but by his 16 Epistle, as he giveth account himself to the Roman Presbyters in that 20th Epistle, *Et quae egerim, says he, loquuntur vobis Epistolae pro temporibus emissa numero tredecim, quas ad vos transmissi, in quibus nec Clero Consilium, nec Confessoribus exhortatio, nec extorribus quando oportuit oburgatio, nec universae Fraternalis ad deprecandam Dei misericordiam allocutio, & persuasio nostra defuit, quantum secundum legem fidei, & timorem Dei, Domina Suggestente, nostra mediocritas potuit eniti.* Item cum comperissem eos, qui sacrilegis contatibus manus atque ora maculassent, vel nefandis libellis nihilominus conscientiam polluisse exambire ad Martyres passim, Confessores quoque importuna & gratuita deprecatione corrumpere ut sine ullo discrimine atque examine singulorum, darentur quotidie libellorum millia contra Evangelii legem, litteras feci quibus Martyres Confessores Consilio meo quantum possem ad Dominica praecepta revocarem (1 Letter was the 15th) Item, Presbyteris & Diaconibus non defuit Sacerdotal Vigor, ut quidam minus Discipline memores, & temeraria festinatione praeterites, qui cum lapsis communicare jam caeperant, comprimerentur, Intercedenti nobis. This was the 16th Epistle. It is certain then, that Cyprian made the disorderly Presbyters find this dint of the Episcopal Vigour he speak by his writing the 16 Epistle. And when you read the 16 Epistle, you easily understand, that he made these Presbyters find the dint of his Episcopal Vigour no other way but by threatening them, That if they persisted in their disorderly Courses, they should be call'd to an Account by him the Presbytery, the Confessors, and the whole People. What Cyprian here, is not unlike to what Cicero says to Atticus l. 1. Ep. 15. *Idem inquit ego receperui, &c.* this Sentence will be cited after.

Have we not reason then to laugh at this Dint of the Episcopal Vigour effect? S. represents the Bishop in the Presbytery, as some ancient Poet (Hercules or Theseus) among the Squadrons of the Enemy, trampling some, cutting off the Legs and Arms of others, and causing the rest to be themselves to their Heels, *quem cruenta per medias rapit ira cades.* To S. speak of the Bishop's making the Presbyters and Deacons find the dint of the Episcopal Vigour, one would think, that Cyprian had his Foot on their Neck. That not only the Office, but the Lives and Fortunes of poor Presbyters, and all that they had was lying at his mercy. But

That this is no strange Gloss, will appear more fully afterward by plenty of Examples; but if you will have one before you go any further, It is no more strange, that the Bishop (as being the principal Officer of the Church, and Representative thereof) should call the Church's *Actus, Arbitrium, Disciplina, Vigor, &c.* His own *Actus, Disciplina, Vigor, &c.* than it was that *Jephtha* should call the People of *Israel*, Himself, and the Land of the People of *Israel*, His own Land. As soon as *Jephtha* was chosen Captain, and made principal Officer, he look'd on himself as the People's Representative, and sent this word to the King of *Ammon*, *What hast thou to do with me, that I have done thee, What hast thou to do with the People of Israel, for if you consider Jephtha personally, he was new-come from the Barn-floor, and the King of Ammon never heard of him, nor knew any thing about him) that thou art come against me to fight in my Land?*

Cyprian's making them to feel the Dint of his Episcopal Vigour, amounts no more but his threatening to complain of them, or to convene them before the whole Church, to give Account of their Actings and Proceedings, and to be censured according to the merit of their Crimes. *Aquari apud nos & apud Confessores ipsos, & apud Plebem universam causam suam, a Domino permittente, in jnnu Maris, Ecclesie colligi experimus.* Epistle ad Ilnem.

Therefore when the Bishop did not overlook things, was nowise remiss or slack, but sharp in his Reproofs, vigorous and warm in his Exhortations, stern in his Threatnings, and did what in him did ly to hold every one to duty, closely pursuing the Point in case of Delinquency, procuring the Delinquents to be censured by the Presbytery, according to the Ecclesiastical Laws; and if he did meet with unreasonable Opposition there, or were over-powered by Votes, laying the Affair before the Provincial Synod, and securing it there with diligence, he made the Delinquents to feel the Dint of his Episcopal Vigour. But how the Church of *Carthage* carried on the disorderly Presbyters after the Return of *Cyprian*, whether they call'd the Synod to their assistance, or whether they did wholly refer the Affair to the Synod, I do not know, but *Cyprian* says of *Fortunatus* one of these disorderly Presbyters in his Epistle 59. which is directed to the Bishop of *Rome*, *Quando & Fortunatus nomen jam suis nescis, qui est ex quinque Presbyteris jam pridem de Ecclesia profugus, & Sententia Concilii nostrorum multorum & gravissimorum virorum nuper absentis.* Per-
It may be said, that *Cyprian* and the Church of *Carthage* depos'd and communicated the disorderly Presbyters, and the Synod ratified their Sentence or Act. Thus Epistle 3, *Cyprian* says to *Regatianus*, *Cum pro Episcopatus Vigore & Cathedralis auctoritate haberes potestatem qua posses de illis statim certi, certus quod collegae tui omnes gratum haberemus quodcumque circa eorum laicum Contumeliosum Sacerdotali potestate facisses.* i. e. Being assur'd, the Synod would ratify your's and your Presbytery's Sentence against the approachful Deacon.

Land? that is, In the Land of the People of *Israel*. If we should make Inferences as *J. S.* uses to do, or *Mr. Dodwel*, and should put such a Gloss upon this Passage of Scripture as they do on many Sentences in *Cyprian*, we would conclude without hesitation, That *Jephtha* was heritable Proprietor of all the Lands of the Nation of *Israel*, as *Pharaoh* was of the Lands of the Kingdom of *Ægypt* in the days of *Joseph*.

Neither can the Bishop's Negative Voice in the Presbytery, be proven from *Cyprian's* saying *Intercedentibus nobis*, in the Sentence cited a little before out of *Ep. 20.* It is true, the Act of the *Roman Tribunes*, whereby they did put a Stop to the Procedure of the Senate, and brought the Cause before the People to be determined by them, us'd to be express'd by this word *Intercedere*, but it must not be inferr'd hence, that this word implieth a Tribunitian Power or Negative Voice where ever it occurs in any Author. The Act of the Mediator *Christ* sitting at the Right Hand of *GOD*, uses to be express'd by *making Intercession*, but how irrational would it be to conclude, That *Elias* was a Mediator in a proper sense, or acted as such, because he is said, *Rom. 11. 2. to make Intercession?* When *Cesar's* Friends offered fair and reasonable Things on his behalf, and the Senate was like to be divided about the Matter, and to hearken to their Proposals, *Cesar* says, *Quod ne fieret, Consules Amici Pompeii intercesserunt. De Bell. Gallic. lib. 8. ad finem.* Must we therefore conclude, That *Pompey's* Friends had a Tribunitian Power and a Negative Voice in the Senate? *J. S.* must know that when the word *Intercedere* is applied to other than *Tribunes*, it has another Sense, and signifies barely to put a Stop to, or hinder, whether by Arguments or Perswasion, Menaces and Vi-

lence †, or the like. *Pompey's* Friends no doubt, hindered the Senate to acquiesce in *Cesar's* Proposals, by threatening some, and making fair Promises to others, &c.

Thus when *Pomponius* (a Bishop) desir'd *Cyprian's* Advice about the Virgins which did ly in the same Beds with the Deacons, pretending that they neither knew them for all that, nor intended any such thing; he gave him this Answer (Ep. 4.) *Intercedendum est cito talibus, dum adhuc separari innocentes possunt, quia dividi postmodum nostra intercessione non poterunt. i. e.* A Stop must quickly be put to them while they are yet innocent, because afterward when they are guilty, they cannot be separated by our Intercession or Prohibition. A *Tribunitian* Intercession was a putting a Legal Stop to the Procedure of a Court; but you see here, that *Intercedere* signifies no more but to hinder. I hope no Man will be so irrational as to think, that Bishop *Pomponius* was to hinder these Deacons and Virgins to ly together, that he was to hinder them, I say, in a *Tribunitian* way, or by exerting a Negative Voice among them, as if they had been a Court, a Senate, or Presbytery.

And thus *Cyprian* said in an Epistle to the People of *Carthage*, That the irregular Presbyters hindered their Tears and hindered their Prayers, &c. Ep. 43. p.

B b

84.

† *Xenophon*, lib. 2. *Hist. Græc.* gives Account, that after the *Athenians* were overcome by *Ixander*, when they were consulting what should be done by the Captives, it was laid to the Charge of the *Athenians*, that they had resolved if they should overcome, to cut off the right hands of all they should take Prisoners; and that when they had taken two Gallies, one belonging to *Corinth* the other to *Andrus*, they did throw all the Men in these Vessels headlong over a Precipice; this was look'd on as a piece of such horrid Cruelty and Barbarity, that it was resolved, That all the *Athenian* Prisoners should be put to death, excepting *Adimantus*, because, saith the Author, *Μόνος ἐπιλάβετο ἐν τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ τὴν περὶ τῆς ἀποτομῆς τῶν χειρῶν ὑψηλίσματος. i. e.* as *Leunclavius* renders the words, Nam is solus decreto Concionis de amputandis manibus Intercesserat: i. e. Opposed that Decree, or dissuaded from it, or hindered it, by holding forth the inhumanity or barbarous cruelty thereof. For no person had a Negative Voice over the People of *Athens*.

84. *Intercedunt Precibus vestris, intercedunt Lachrymis, intercedunt Paci quam vere & fideliter de Domini misericordia postulatu.* These Presbyters did hinder the Prayers and Tears of the Lapsers, not by a *Tribunitian* Intercession, but by receiving them into the Church, or admitting them to Ordinances too hastily, before they had given any Evidences of Repentance, and that this might be done without any thing that looks like *Tribunitian* Intercession is very evident. *J. S.* may affirm as frequently as he pleases, that these Presbyters hindred the Repentance of these who fell in the Persecution by way of *Tribunitian* Intercession; but he can never prove it, unless he prove one of these two Things, either, That there is no possible way to hinder any Action or Practice but by a *Tribunitian* Intercession, and then he must say, that the Devil hindred *Paul* to come to *Thessalonica* by a *Tribunitian* Intercession, because he says, *We would have come unto you even I Paul once and again, but Satan hindred us*: Or, Whereever to hinder any thing is expressed by the word *Intercedere*, it implies alwise, that the hindrance is made by such *Tribunitian* Intercession, or by exerting what we call a Negative Voice, which is altogether false as is evident by the above-mentioned Examples out of *Cæsar's* Commentaries, and *Cyprian's* 4th. Epistle.

But says *J. S.* *Cyprian* was highly offended at these Presbyters for usurping a Negative Voice in the Presbytery, and taking upon them a *Tribunitian* Power which did not belong to them. *Cyprian* alwise condemns, says *J. S.* the extravagant Impudence, intolerable Presumption, and bare-fac'd Usurpation of these Presbyters, because they exercised this Power, wherefore it seems, they did usurp such a Power in the Presbytery, seing *Cyprian* exclaim so much against them on that account. But these are groundless Fancies. *Cyprian* was indeed offended at these Presbyters, and exclaim'd against them [for
hin

hindring the Repentance of the Lapsers; but how does it appear, he was offended, because they hindered their Repentance and Prayers in a *Tribunitian* way: there is no shadow of a Reason for this, but what is founded on the sound of the word *Intercedere*, and we have made it appear that this is nothing at all.

No Person can dream, that these Presbyters hinder'd the Repentance of the Lapsers by way of *Tribunitian* Intercession if he know how the Case stood. It was thus, Some of the *Cartaginian* Presbyters having fallen into gross Crimes, and knowing they could not escape Deposition or Excommunication, separated from the Church, and join'd a Schismatical Faction made up of the baser sort; and that they might strengthen this Faction by Numbers, they open'd a Door to the Lapsers, or these who did fall in the Persecution, and this they did, by receiving them into Communion, or admitting them to the Table of the Lord upon easy Terms, without putting them to the trouble of undergoing that long and tedious Course of Penance which was appointed by the Canons; and this scandalous Practice they did encourage and begin, before they went off to the Schismatical Conventicle, having an Eye no doubt to their intended Separation. And such a length did they go, that they admitted to the Table of the Lord the Lapsers who came over to them, when their hands were as yet warm with the Blood of the Sacrifices which they had offer'd to the Heathen gods. And this was the *Intercession* of these Presbyters which *Cyprian* exclaim'd so much against, this was the way they hinder'd the Repentance and Mourning of the Lapsers, this was the Method they did take *Intercedere Precibus, intercedere eorum Lachrymis*. And if this was an exerting a *Tribunitian* Power, or a Negative Voice in the Presbytery, it is easy to judge.

Thus Cyprian giveth Account of the Affair to Cornelius Bishop of Rome, Not to mention, said he, their fraudulent Tricks, Conspiracies, Adulteries, and various Crimes, they did not stand in the very beginning of the Persecution, when the Crimes of the Delinquents were yet recent, and not only the Devils Altars, but the very hands and mouths of the Lapsers were warm with the curs'd Sacrifices, to Communicate with these Lapsers, and to Interceed or hinder the Course of their Repentance *.

Moreover, the disorderly Presbyters were five in Number, and in the whole Presbytery there were but three more, wherefore it can't be suppos'd, that the five Presbyters being the major Part, did interceed in a Tribunitian way.

Then the Roman Tribunes had not a Negative in the Senate, as the King has in the Parliament or the modern Prelate pretends to in the Church their *Intercession* was but a referring to the People or a taking an Affair out of the hands of the Senate and bringing it before them for final Determination. Wherefore, if they will urge the proper signification of the word *Intercedere* or *Tribunitian* sent thereof, they will gain nothing by it but subject their Bishop to the Laitie as they call them, as the Tribunes were subject to the People of Rome.

After all, *Intercedere* is no where applied to Bishops in all Cyprian's Epistles, that I can remember but in two places, and it has no affinity with Negative Voice in either of them. The first, is the before cited Sentence out of Cyprian's 4th Epistle where he says to Pomponius with respect to the Vigins and Deacons, *Intercedendum est cito talibus*, and he

* Taceo itaque de fraudibus Ecclesiæ factis, Conjuraciones : & Adulterii & varia delictorum genera prætereo, unum illud (in quo non mea nec minum sed Dei causa est) de eorum facinore non puto esse reticendum quod a primo statim persecutionis die cum recentia Diaboli Altaria, sed ad ra ferverent, & sacrificiis nefandis non tantum Diaboli Altaria, sed ad manus ipsæ lapsorum & ora fumarent Communicare cum Lapsis, & penitus agenda *Intercedere* non destiterunt, Ep: 59. p. 133, 134.

how far it is from importing in that place the thing we call a Negative Voice in a Court, it is needless to tell you over again. The other is in Epistle 20, the Sentence is also already cited, and *Intercedentibus nobis* in that place, comes to no more but *Cyprian's* endeavouring by Exhortations or Threatnings in his Letter 16. to hinder the foresaid Presbyters to admit the Lapsers to Communion too hastily, as any Person may see who will Consult the place. Then *Cyprian* did not say *Intercedentibus nobis* with respect to the Presbytery, or did not put a Stop, or endeavour to put a Stop to the Procedure of the Presbytery, but to the Practice of some disorderly Members of it.

In the next place, It is scarce worth the while to answer what he says with respect to the Bishop's having a *Censorian* Power, seeing the Consuls who were above the Censures, and had a far more considerable Power, had no Negative Voice in the Senate, And why may not the Presbyters pretend to a Censorian Power as well, seeing *Ferom* speaks of the Censure of the Bishops and Presbyters. *Epist. ad Demetrium*. †.

I hope *J. S.* will now retract all he has written from the beginning of his 6 Chap. to § 21, and will never say to the World any more, The Bishops are the Successors of the Apostles: Seeing Mr. *Dodwel* declares positively, *De nuper. Schism. Anglican. p. 68. Defecerat cum ultimo Apostolo etiam Apostolatus Officium, cum nulli unquam præterquam Judæ Proditoris succederentur Apostolorum successores. i. e.* The Apostolical Office did end with the last Apostle, and no Apostle had ever any Successor except *Judas* the Traitor. If *G. R.* or *T. F.* had said so, *J. S.* would have been at them Tooth and Nail; but seeing his Dictator Mr. *Dodwel* has said it, he must lay his hand on his mouth,

† Nec hoc de omnibus dicimus sed de his quos Ecclesia ipsa reprehendit, quos interdum abjicit, in quos non unquam Episcoporum & Presbyterorum Censura descendit.

mouth, and keep a respectful Silence. The Learn'd D. Barrow clears in what sense the Bishops may be call'd the Successors of the Apostles very judiciously, *Pop. Supr. p. 116. &c.* you have his words in the margin *. And withal, it must be remember'd, that J. S.'s Bishops whom the Apostles knew nothing of, cannot be reckon'd their Successors, but that sort of Bishops only whom the Apostles themselves ordain'd, *to wit*, Pastours of one Congregation.

He tells us afterward, the Church is compar'd to a *Ship*, and the Bishop is call'd *Gubernator Steersman*.

* The Fathers commonly do call Bishops Successors of the Apostles, but we must consider, that whereas the Apostolical Office virtually did contain the Functions of Teaching and Ruling God's People, the which for preservation of Christian Doctrine, and Edification of the Church, were requisite to be continued perpetually in ordinary standing Offices; these indeed were derived from the Apostles, but not properly in way of Succession, as by univocal Propagation, but by Ordination, imparting all the Power needful for such Offices: Which therefore, were exercised by Persons during the Apostles Lives concurrently, or in subordination to them; even as a Dictator at Rome might create inferior Magistrates, who derived from him their Power, but not as his Successors, for as *Bellarmin* himself telleth us, *There can be no proper Succession but in respect of one Preaching, but Apostles and Bishops were together in the Church.* The Fathers therefore so in a large sense, call all Bishops Successors of the Apostles, not meaning that any one of them did succeed into the whole Apostolical Office, but that each did receive his Power from some one (immediately or mediately) whom some Apostle did constitute Bishop, vesting him with Authority to feed the particular Flock committed to him in way of ordinary Charge, according to the Saying, of *Clement Romanus* --- thus did the Bishops supply the room of the Apostles each in guiding his particular Charge, all of them together by mutual Aid, conspiring to govern the whole Body of the Church. In which regard it may be said, That not one single Bishop but all the Bishops together thro' the whole Church do succeed St. Peter or any other Apostle; for that all of them in union together have an universal Sovereign Authority commensurate to an Apostle. This is the Notion which St. Cyprian doth so much insist upon, affirming, that the Bishops do succeed St. Peter and the other Apostles by *Vicarious Ordination*, that the Bishops are *Apostles*, that there is but *one Chair by the Lord's Word built upon one Peter, one undivided Bishoprick divided in the perceptible number of many Bishops, whereof each Bishop will hold his Share; and that the Apostles by unanimous Agreement did find, and which afterwards the Bishops do find, having a Portion thereof allotted to each while he should govern.* And a little before, the Apostolical Office as such, was Personal and Temporary.

How could the Bishops succeed the Apostles, while the Apostles were yet living? were they advanced to a higher Office, or degraded for not owning the Authority of the Civil Magistrate? To be the Apostles Successors in Apostolical Power, the Apostles yet alive and in plenitude of Power, is a very great Mystery, and something a-kim to the honest Vicar of Newbury's *quandem* Prayer for King Charles II. *That he might out-live all his Successors,* as says the judicious and excellent Vindicator of M. H.'s brief Inquiry into the nature of Schism. *Ambrose* did not imagine that he was an Apostle: says he, *Nisi igitur inter Apostolorum gloriam tendas, quæ tantæ ecclesiæ præipectæ sunt elegit Deus.* *Om. l. 2. c. 2.*

Man, hence he concludes, whatever Power the Steers-Man has in the Ship, the Bishop has the same in the Church. He sits at the Helm, says he, and manages the *Gubernaculum*. I know not what Idea *J. R.* may have of his beloved Parity, but I doubt it would not do well in a Ship; even the *Dutch* themselves, as much as they are for a Democracy on any Land, do yet allow of Monarchy in every Ship.

But of all the Arguments that can be invented, these are the most miserable, which are drawn from Similitude stretched beyond its due Limits. The Bishop is Steers-Man, therefore he is Monarch in the Ship of the Church, what can be said more weak? The Lord said to *Moses* that he should be as God to Aaron, must we therefore conclude, that *Moses* was Omnipotent, Omnipresent, &c? The Woman said, as an Angel of God so is my Lord the King, could therefore the King flee in the Air, or mount up to Heaven in a Flame of Fire, because an Angel can do so, and the King is as an Angel? *J. S.* might well have reason'd after this manner, The Steers-Man wears Boots in the Ship, therefore the Bishop *Cyprian's* time did wear Boots in the Church. We must know then, that some Resemblance in one small Point is Foundation enough for a Simile or Metaphore, tho there be a vast discrepancy in all other things.

There is no difficulty at all in the Bishop's being call'd *Præpositus* with respect to the Presbyters, *Highest*, *Pastour in chief*, his being exalted to the *Sublime fastigium sacerdotii*, held the Ballance of Government, or the like. Besides, that these things will not prove he had a Negative in the Presbytery, they quadrate very well with the Parochial Bishop. *Baptista Nani* says of *Francisco Contarini*, *Hist. de Ven. T. 1. 6.* That he did worthily sustain the Burthen of Sovereignty. Certainly that Duke had the Bal-
lance

lance of the Government in his hand, but had he therefore Absolute Power or a Negative Voice?

At length *J. S.* as if all the greatness he has already conferr'd on his Bishop, were too little, he will have him made a King, and have *Majesty* ascrib'd to him. As to my part, I shall not oppose, provided the thing be understood *sano sensu*, and made to import no more but this, That the Bishop is the supreme and principal Ecclesiastical Officer in his Church, as the King is the principal Civil Officer in his Kingdom: Tho, if I remember right, *Cyprian* nowhere ascribes *Majesty* to the Bishop, but only to the People, *Plebis intuitu positæ fidelis atque incorrupta Majestas*, and if he had he would have mistaken it egregiously, seeing the Apostolical Office it self was but a *Ministry*, *VVbereo*, I Paul am made a Minister. But if *J. S.* pretend to infer from the Bishop's being as King in his Church that he has a Princely Power or a Negative Voice I must humbly differ from him.

Now tho we have given a particular, and, I think full and satisfactory Answer to all the Argument for the Bishop's Monarchical Power, brought by *J. S.* from Terms or Phrases, and Episcopal Prerogatives (as he calls them) occurring in *Cyprian's* Monuments; notwithstanding, that it may if possible appear yet more clearly such Arguments are totall ineffectual to prove the Bishops had such Power, and that no room may be left for doubting, I desire may be consider'd, that by the same Method *J. S.* takes to prove the Bishop had such Power (that is by Arguments taken from Phrases or certain Modes of expression to be met with in ancient Histories and from Prerogatives, or Actions implying Authority and Power, attributed to some particular Persons in such Histories) we may prove as evidently nay with greater shew of Probability, that the principal Officers or Magistrates in the Republicks

Rome or Athens had a Monarchical or Absolute Power, than J. S. or any other Prelatical Writer can prove (by Terms or Phrases to be met with, whether in the Works of Cyprian, or any other Ecclesiastical Author of the first 4. or 5. Centuries) that the Bishop had such a Power. Take Pericles the Athenian for an Example.

In the first place, Thucydides says of this Pericles, l. 1. p. 70. § 127. That being the most powerful Man at Athens, and the Person that did administer the Common-wealth (ἀγων τὴν πολιτείαν) he would not permit them to yield to the Lacedemonians (καὶ οὐκ εἶα ὑπέκειν) where does Cyprian say, that he or any other Bishop would not permit the Presbytery to do such a thing? Again he tells us, that when the Lacedemonian Army was in the Athenian Country, and many were of Opinion they should go out and fight them, Pericles would call no Assembly or Meeting of the People (this is equivalent to Cornelius's saying Placuit contrahi Presbyterium) but kept the City in quiet, and sent out Horsemen from time to time. Thucyd. l. 2: p. 97. § 22. Afterward he says, The Athenians intrusted him with all their Affairs (πάντα τὰ πράγματα ἐπέτερεσαν) Lib. 2. p. 121. 65. And what can be said more of the King of France, than that he is intrusted with all the Affairs of the Kingdom?

And says the same Author *ibidem*, While he had the charge of the Common-wealth in time of Peace, he Govern'd it with Moderation (*Quamdiu enim Reipublicæ præfuit in pace, eam moderate rexit*, as the accurate Translator M. Hudson renders the words) And under his Empire, adds Thucyd. The Common-wealth arriv'd to its greatest height (*ejusque sub Imperio ad maximam Potentiam evecta erat.*) He says further, That he kept the People or Common-wealth in their Duty, and ruled them as much as he was ruled by them (*Plebem in Officio liberaliter contineret, nec ab ea magis regebatur, quam ip-*

se eam regeret) *Thucyd. ibid.* Nay further, our Author says *Ibidem*, his Authority was so great, That he alone could oppose the whole Common-wealth, and even chastise them when he thought they did amiss. (*Sed eam pro autoritate castigare quin etiam nonnullis in rebus ei palam adverjari poterat.*) I defy *J. S.* to Name any Writing of any Father, or Canon of any Council in the first five or six Centuries, in which it is declar'd, That the Bishop may himself oppose the whole Church and Presbytery, and chastise them.

And *Plutarch* says of this same *Pericles*, (see *Plutarch's* Lives translated by several hands) Vol. 1. p. 526, 527. ' That every Year he sent out 60 Gallies, on board ' of which were several of the Citizens, &c. And ' that he sent 1000 Citizens to the *Chersonese*, to ' share the Land among them by Lot, and 500 into ' the Isle of *Naxos*, and half that Number into the ' Isle of *Andros*, and 1000 into *Thrace* to dwell among ' the *Baltae*, and others into *Italy*, &c. Again says he, *ibid. p. 534.* ' *Pericles* did enact or make a De- ' cree, that a Prize should be plaid in the Science ' of Musick every Year, &c. And in p. 538. *Peri- ' cles* threw out his Antagonist *Thucydides*, and ba- ' nished him for ten Years †. This is equivalent to what *Cyprian* said to Bishop *Rogatianus*, Thou may'st use the Power of thine Honour against him, (the unruly Deacon) either by Deposing or Excommunicating him. Again says *Plutarch*, p. 239. ' *Peri- ' cles* in a trice brought about all *Athens* to his own ' Devotion, and got the disposal of all Affairs that ' belong'd to the *Athenians* into his own hands, their ' Customs, and their Armies, and their Gallies, and ' their Islands, and the Sea, and that great Power ' and Strength which accrued to them, &c. In a ' word, such a Seigniory and Dominion, &c. And

P

† *Ibi cum* (*Porcius Cato*) diutius moraretur, *P. Scipio Africanus* Consul iterum, cujus in priore Consulatu *Quæstor* fuerat, voluit eum de *Provincia* depellere, &c. *Corn. Nepos in Vita Pœrc. Caton.*

p. 540. ' Sometimes he did lead the People along
 ' with their own Wills and Consents, by perswading
 ' and shewing them what was to be done, and some-
 ' time too ruffling them, and forcing them full fore
 ' against their will, he made them whether they
 ' would or no to close with what he proposed, &c.
 Does not this look right like Absolute Power think
 you, that one Man should force the Common-wealth,
 and oblige them to do what he had amind fore against
 their wills? And p. 551. ' He made a Decree, That
 ' 600 of the *Athenians* that were willing to go, should
 ' sail to *Sinope* and plant themselves there with the
 ' *Sinopians*, &c. J. S. will let us hear of the Decrees
 of the Bishops or Synod, but not of any one Bishop.
 And p. 551. ' *Pericles* curb'd this extravagant Hu-
 ' mour of making Excursions abroad, and choack'd
 ' their over-busie Fancies, which put them upon
 ' meddling with so much Business at once. (*viz.*
 when they were thinking on the Conquest of *Sicily*,
Tuscany and *Carthage*) ' and turning the most and
 ' greatest part of their Force and Power to the pre-
 ' serving and securing what they had already got-
 ' ten, &c. And p. 556. After this was over, says
 ' *Plutarch*, having made a Truce between the *Athe-*
 ' *nians* and *Lacedemonians* for 30 Years, he orders by
 ' publick Decree, an Expedition against the Isle of
 ' *Samos*. Here our Author speaks of *Pericles* as if
 he had had the Power of Peace and War. Pag. 581.
 ' He sends out a Fleet of 100 Sail to *Peloponnesus*, re-
 ' lieves the common People with distributions of
 ' publick Money, and made a Law for the Division
 ' of Lands by Lot, and the Plantation of Colonies;
 ' for having turn'd out the People of *Ægina*, he par-
 ' ted the Island among the *Athenians*, according as
 ' their Lot fell. And p. 590. Tho' it look'd some-
 ' what odd and strange, that a Law should be broken
 ' and cancell'd again by the same Man that made
 ' it. Here *Pericles* is represented as having a Power

by his sole Authority, to abrogate and make Laws for the whole Common-wealth, the Senate as well as others,

In a word, *Thucydides* says, *Lib. 2. p. 121. § 65.* That in *Pericles's* time the Government was call'd Democratical, but was really Monarchical, being in the hands of the principal Man (*quare verbo quidem erat Dominatus popularis, sed re ipsa penes primarium populi virum principatus erat.*) And *Plutarch* affirms (*Vol. 1. p. 593.*) That his Power was absolute and incontrollable. *J. S.* cannot produce such full Assertions for the Absolute Power of the Bishop, either out of *Cyprian* or any other Author who lived in his time, or before, or a hundred Years after.

Yet notwithstanding all these Things, Terms, Phrases, Modes of Expression, Prerogatives, and Acts of Power attributed to *Pericles*, full Assertions, &c. the Government of that City was purely Democratical, and *Pericles* had no Authority and Power over the *Athenians*, nor Influence upon them but by way of Perswasion, and thro' their voluntar Condescension, as every body knows; *Pericles* was an expert and cunning Statesman, had the knack of managing that People, and the Art to perswade them to do the things he was for and propos'd, and that was all. Wherefore, notwithstanding all the *Cyprianick* Phrases, or Acts of Power attributed to Bishops, in the Works of that or any other contemporary Author, the Government of the Church might be Democratical at that time, as the Government of *Athens* was Democratical, notwithstanding all the Phrases in *Thucydides* and *Plutarch*, full Assertions, and Acts of Power attributed to *Pericles* in the Works of these Authors *, And there is no more

* The People of *Athens* could amerce or fine him when they took it in their head, pull him down or advance him as they thought fit. *Nec prius universi iram, quam in eum conceperant, deposuerunt, quam eum pecunia mulctarunt: vixit tamen non multo post (id quod vulgus facere solet) ipsum belli ducem elegerunt, eique rerum omnium administrationem commiserunt.* i. e. Nei-

more reason to think, that *Cyprian* (or any other Bishop in the 3d or 4th Century) had Absolute Power and a Negative Voice, or was a Monarch in the Church, than there is to think, that *Pericles* was Monarch of the Common-wealth of *Athens*. And no person will be deceived by the Arguments of Mr. *Dodwel* and *J. S.* for the Bishop's Monarchical Power in the days of *Cyprian*, but they who are ignorant of the Stile of ancient Authors, and unacquainted with their way and manner of wording things. This Argument, for Example, *Cyprian said to Rogatianus*, Thou mayest use the Power of thine Honour, either by Deposing or Excommunicating the Deacon, ergo, a Bishop could by his sole Authority depose and excommunicate a Deacon, ergo, the Bishop had a Monarchical Power in the Church, is never a whit more valid than such an Argument as this. *Plutarch says*, *Pericles made a 30 Years Truce between the Athenians and Lacedemonians*, or *threw out his Antagonist Thucydides and sent him to Banishment*, ergo, *Pericles*, could by his sole Authority banish the principal Men in the Common-wealth, ergo, he had Absolute Power and was Monarch of *Athens*. If any should propose this Argument to *J. S.* pretending to prove thereby, that *Pericles* had a Monarchical Power in the Common-wealth, he would Answer, when *Plutarch says*, *Pericles sent Thucydides into Banishment*, his meaning is, That *Pericles* procur'd his Banishment, prevail'd with the People to Banish him. And say I, *Cyprian's* meaning is, That *Rogatianus* might prevail with, or cause the Presbytery depose the Deacon.

If one had a mind to ransack all the Greek and Roman Authors, and had time to do it, he might have heaps and Cart-loads of such Phrases. What more
or.

either was the Anger of the *Athenians* against *Pericles* asswag'd until they an'd him. But again, not long after that, (as the Multitude uses to do) they choosed him General, and committed all their Affairs to him. *Thucyd. lib. 2. Sect. 65.*

ordinary than to say of a Roman Consul, *Quem penes Urbanarum sunt fastigia rerum. Laudata cives ratione gubernans. Urbis sortitus habenas. Gerens impositum Urbis onus. Moderans populosam legibus Urbem.* Or things of this kind? Yet no person ever thought, that a Consul had either Absolute Power or a Negative Voice. How can it be concluded then from such Phrases, that Bishops had a Negative Voice in the 3d. Century?

Plutarch says, That *Themistocles* laughing one time at his Son a Boy, who was something bold through the indulgence and fondness of his Mother, said He had most Power of any one in *Greece*; For the *Athenians*, said he, command the rest of *Greece*, command the *Athenians*, your Mother commands me and you command your Mother. According to *J. S.*'s way of Arguing, *Themistocles*, the Mother and the Boy were Absolute Monarchs. Why? *Themistocles* commanded the *Athenians*, &c.

In fine, why may it not be thought, that many of these Terms or Phrases and full Assertions *J.* builds so much upon, have respect not so much to the Power of the Bishops, as their dexterity and skill, they being ordinarily the ablest Men in the Church? Thus he who writ the Epitaph of the admirable Mr. *Claude*, says of him,

Ecclesiam infeliciſſimis temporibus,

Per medios fluctus & procellas,

Prudentiſſime rexit;

Et ſi fata voluiſſent,

Hac mente, hac dextra deſenſa fuiſſet.

Yet Mr. *Claude* had no more Power than any other Minister in *France*. If *Pontius* had said so of *Cyprian*, behold, would *J. S.* have said, A Sovereign and independent Monarch, and we should have had *R.* egregiously distinguish'd by capital Letters, to set forth the Majesty, Grandeur, and Absolute Power of the Bishop.

ƒ. S. tells us very plainly, That the Bishop in *Cyprian's* time had Absolute Power, that by himself, by his own singular Authority, he could have given Laws to all within his Diocess, to the Presbyters as well as others, and that he did it not alwise, was the result of Prudence, not any defect of Power: And that the Bishop then had such Power by Divine Appointment, when *Cyprian* enter'd to his Bishoprick, he resolv'd to do nothing without the Advice and Consent of his Clergy and People; but says ƒ. S. That was intirely the result of his own free Choice, had he pleas'd he needed not have done it, there was no more in it than his own voluntary Condescension, it was a thing he was not bound to by any *Divine Prescript*, or any Apostolical Tradition, or any Ecclesiastical Constitution, viz: Thus to determine with himself to do nothing of Consequence without the Advice of his Clergy, and the Consent of his People. And have we not reason to wonder, how he could pretend after this, to justify the *Scottish* Constitution of Prelacy, by which the Bishop was confin'd and limited to a Negative Voice.

In the first place, says ƒ. S. tho the *Cyprianick* Bishop had such Power, it was not alwise that he interpos'd with this Absolute or singular Authority; ordinarily, and for the most part he brought Matters to the *Confessus* or Presbytery; and no doubt, says ƒ. S. Bishops in this did act very prudently. That is plainly, the Bishops in *Cyprian's* time acted prudently in not exerting, or taking upon them that Power which Christ had vested them with. But if the *Cyprianick* Bishops had not acted prudently, if they had alwise acted without the Presbyters, or had exerted an Absolute Power, the Question will be, With what prudence an Absolute Power, or a Power to act without the Presbyters, was conferr'd on the Bishops? Will ƒ. S. say, That Christ vested

the Bishops in that Age with a Power, which to exert, would have been an imprudent thing?

Again, says *J. S.* tho the Bishops in the *Cyprianick* Age had Absolute Power, yet they judged it prudent in most Cases, to act by the Advice of their respective Presbyteries: And hence he concludes, that the Bishops of that Age, themselves being Judges, there was no Error in the *Scotish* Constitution, according to which, the Prelates were by Act of Parliament limited to act with the Consent and Advice of their Presbyters, *That is*, Tho Christ vested the Prelates with Absolute Power, yet the *Scotish* Parliament did nothing amiss in divesting them of it, and limiting them to a Negative Voice. But would the King of *France* think that no injury were done to him, if the Confederates should set up a Parliament in his Kingdom like that of *England*, and limite him to a Negative Voice? Is there no injury in forcing Men by Act of Parliament to what they are not oblig'd, unless they condescend voluntarily? The Bishop of *Brechin* or Dean of *Dumblain* may, if they please, condescend voluntarily to bind themselves Apprentices to the Cobler at *Curry*, or Weaver at *West-kirk*, to use *J. S.*'s Simile, but if they were forced thereto by Act of Parliament, would no injury be done to them? If Christ gave the Bishops Absolute Power, *J. S.* will not deny, that he gave it them for the good of the Church, wherefore it must be said without doubt, that it was our Saviour's Intention the Bishops should exert that Power, when they did see that the good of the Church required it. Was it no Error then in the *Scotish* Parliament, to hinder their Prelates to exert that Power which Christ himself gave them for the good of the Church? Was it no Injury to the *Scotish* Churches, to be deprived of the unspeakable Advantages they might have expected by their Prelates exerting Absolute Power or Domination over them, as oft as the
judg

judged that was for their good? If Christ himself empower'd the Prelates to interpose with their *singular Authority* when they thought fit, did not the *Scotish* Parliament Rebel against Christ when they took away this singular Authority, rob'd the Prelates of their Absolute Power, and made them submit to the Slavery and Drudgery of a Negative Voice? No says *J. S.* the *Cyprianick* Bishops themselves being Judges, there was no Error in the *Scotish* Constitution whereby the late Prelates were limited and confin'd to a Negative Voice,

Well then, if the Civil Magistrate may restrict the Bishops to a Negative Voice tho Christ gave them Absolute Power, why may not the same Magistrate restrict or limite the Jurisdiction of a Bishop to one single Congregation, tho Christ appointed that it should be extended over many Congregations? I would be content then to know, what is *J. S.*'s Quarrel against good ancient *Scotish* Presbyterian Episcopacy, which was so much beloved by our honest Ancestors? or, I would be content to know, why he is such a bitter Enemy to Congregational Bishops? *J. S.* thinks, that the *Scotish* Parliament did well to confine the late Bishops to a Negative Voice, tho Jesus Christ himself gave them Absolute Power; how much more rationally and securely then may we think, that they did well to limite and confine the Jurisdiction of each Bishop within their Territories, to the bounds of one single Congregation, seing neither *J. S.* nor any other Person can prove either by Scripture, Reason, or Antiquity, that it was the Intention of Christ, or that he commanded that the Jurisdiction of each Bishop should be extended over many particular Congregations?

Nay, so far was the *Scotish* Parliament from incurring any guiltiness by their limiting the Bishops to a Negative Voice, that (according to *J. S.*) they

did thereby deliver the Churches in this Kingdom from that hazard of Arbitrary Government, which the Churches all the World over were expos'd to in *Cyprian's* time, by the Absolute Power of the Bishops. *The Cyprianick bishops* (says he p. 350.) *tho commonly they acted with consent of their Presbyters, yet were they not bound up by Canons from acting Absolutely, when they saw occasion for it; whereas our Scottish Bishops are limited by the very Constitution, to do nothing of consequence by themselves; and by consequence there is not now that hazard of Arbitrary Government in Scotland, as there was all the VWorld over in the days of St. Cyprian.* To be delivered from the hazard of Arbitrary Government, is in the Opinion of all rational and thinking Men, to be delivered from a very great Mischief, even as great a Plague as can befall any Society Civil or Ecclesiastical, but especially Ecclesiastical. And seing in the Opinion of *J. S.* Christ did vest the Bishops in *Cyprian's* time with that Absolute Power which they had, it will follow, that the *Scottish* Parliament, by taking away the Absolute Power of Bishops here, and limiting them by Law to a Negative Voice, delivered the Churches in this Nation from the hazard of a very great Mischief and Plague, which the Churches all the World over in *Cyprian's* time and upwards were expos'd to even by *Jesus Christ* himself. What an excellent Parliament was that *Scottish* Parliament which was more merciful, and more tender of the Church's Good than was *Jesus Christ* himself! How happy would the Nation of *England* be, if they could get such a Parliament, a Parliament that could alter Divine Institutions to the Advantage of the Church?

This now is one of these fine Corollaries which follows from what *J. S.* writes in defence of the *Scottish* Constitution of late Prelacy, contrary to his own avow'd Principles. If he can extricate him

self handsomely here, *erit mihi magnus Apollo*, I shall look on him as a great Artist after that, not such an one as the Cobler at Curry, but such as Mr. *Dodwel* himself, who can easily prove any thing, even that the Soul of Man is Naturally Mortal, if he fancy that such a Notion may contribute to advance the Greatness or Absolute Power of his Bishops.

CHAP. V.

The Sentences in Cyprian's Works, which seem to import, That the Bishop had Absolute Power, or that he alone could dispose of Ecclesiastical Affairs within his own Diocese, more particularly considered.

BUT what are these Sentences in *Cyprian's Works*, by which they think so evidently to prove, that the Bishops had Absolute Power in the third Century? They are such as these,

Quando habeat omnis Episcopus pro licentia libertatis & potestatis suæ arbitrium proprium, tamque judicari ab alio non potest, quam nec ipse potest judicare: Tom. 1. p. 229. And, *Nemini præscribentes aut præjudicantes quominus unusquisque Episcoporum quod putat faciat, habens arbitrii sui liberam potestatem †.* Or, *Si judicium nostrum voluerint experiri, veniant. Patientia & facilitas & humanitas nostra venientibus præsto est. Remitto omnia, multa dissimulo, studio & voto colligente Fraternitatis, etiam ea quæ in Deum commissa sunt, non pleno judicio Religionis examino, delictis plusquam*
opor-

oportet remittendis, pene ipse delinquo, &c. (a) And Nemine præscribentes quo minus statuat quod putat unusquisque Præpositus Actus sui rationem Domino redditurus. (b) Such Sentences J. S. calls Very full Assertions of the Episcopal Power. In like manner, the Canons of Councils are call'd Decreta Episcoporum, &c.

I'm of Opinion, that as much is said already, as may satisfy unprejudiced Persons, as to the meaning of such Assertions, that they do not imply, that the Bishop had a Negative Voice in the Church, much less Absolute Power; yet that the most obstinate among us may have no reason to scruple, and that it may appear, that we have a desire to satisfy all, even J. S. himself, we are willing to insist more fully on this Particular.

We say then, it will not follow, that the Bishop had a Negative Voice, or Absolute Power, and that he could act in Affairs of Government alone; or without the Authoritative concurrence of the Presbytery, because Cyprian says, Every Bishop may act according to his own Arbitriment, and licence of his own Liberty and Power; and can as little be call'd to an Account by others, as he can call them to an Account. Or because he says, Let them come if they will and be judged by me, I can pardon all Crimes, I dissemble many, I'm almost faulty my self in remitting Faults so easily, &c. It will not follow, that Rogatianus might without the Church and Presbytery depose the Deacon because Cyprian writ to him, Thou mayest Depose or Excommunicate him. It will not follow, that the Bishop alone did or might do such and such things, because it is said in Cyprian's Epistles, Canons of Councils, or elsewhere, That he did or might do such things. Neither will it follow, that the Bishops alone (c) had Decisive Voices in Synod

(a) Cypr. Ep. 59. p. 138.

(b) Cypr. Ep. 69. p. 188.

(c) If the Presbyters, in Cyprian's time had no Decisive Voice in Synod or Councils, according to J. S. they can lay no Claim to such a Privilege

or Councils, because the Canons are call'd the *Decrees of the Bishops*, and not the *Decrees of the Bishops and Presbyters*. Says *J. S.* The Canon mentioned by *Cyprian* Epist. 1. forbidding Clergy Men to be nominated Tutors, was made by Bishops met in Council (not by Bishops and Presbyters) and the Canon allowing Adulterers to do Penance and to be reconcil'd, was clearly enacted by the Episcopal Authority. And thus because the Presbyters are not mention'd, *J. S.* concludes, that they did not concur in making these or the like Canons. But no such Inference can be made from thence, as will appear by what follows.

Paul said to *Timothy*, *Lay hands suddenly on no Man*, will it hence follow, that no Person was to join with *Timothy* in that Action? No more certainly than it will follow, that *David* smote the *Philistines* alone, and without the help of the Army, because it is written, *And David came to Baal-perazim and smote them there*. Or then it will follow, that *Paul* alone laid hands on *Timothy*, because it is said, *Stir up the gift of God which is in thee, by the putting on of my hands*. It being evident from *1 Tim. 4. 14.* that the Presbytery join'd with him in that Action. And if *Timothy* alone laid on hands, why did the *Nicene* Fathers appoint, that a Bishop should be ordained by all the Bishops of the Province, or by three at least? Or the 4 Council of *Carthage* Decree, That when one of the Bishops pronounces the Blessing, all the other Bishops who are present shall touch his head with their hands? And were not these Ordina-

na-

Deo, how comes it then, that they have a Decisive Voice in the *English* Convocation, in the National Synod of that Church, which does nothing but what is of Divine and Apostolical Original? Either then the Church of *England* believes that Presbyters had a Decisive Voice in ancient Councils, or it has no regard to the Institutions of *Jesus Christ*. And his be it would seem, that these among us who are so much in love with the Government of the Church of *England*, and cry it up as Primitive and Apostolical, are not influenced by love or respect to Divine Institutions, but by a factious and seditious Humour, or a Schismatical Disposition of

nations which were perform'd by fewer than three Bishops reckon'd uncanonical, null and void? And would not this have been intolerable Presumption, if they had thought that the Apostle order'd *Timothy* to lay on hands alone? If then we may look on the Canons of Councils, and the Practice of the Church Universal, as a good Commentary on these words of *Paul*, they must be paraphras'd after this manner *You O Timothy and they who join with you in Ordinations, must not be too hasty in laying on hands.* The like must be said of that other Apostolick Direction *Against an Elder receive not an Accusation, but before two or three Witnesses. i. e.* You and they who join with you in the Government, receive not an Accusation against, &c. Thus *Optatus l. 1.* says, *Tunc Suffragio totius Populi Cæcilianus eligitur, & manus impo-nente Felice Episcopus ordinatur.* That is, *Cæcilia* was elected by the Suffrages of all the People, and Ordain'd by the laying on of the hands of *Felix*: i. e. Of *Felix* and the Bishops who concurr'd with him in that Action.

And what more ordinary than to say, That *Victor* Bishop of *Rome* Excommunicated the *Asiatick* Churches. Thus *Eusebius* (*Eccl. Hist. l. 5. c. 24.*) He (*Victor*) pronounced all the Brethren there, in *Asia*, totally off from the Communion of the Church. *Datisque literis universos qui illic erant Fratres proscribit, & ab unitate Ecclesiæ prorsus alienos esse pronunciat,* as *Vales* renders the words. *Eusebius* you see, words it so, if this had been done by *Victor* alone, without the Authoritative Concurrence of any others. Yet the Bishop of *Rome* was so far from having such a Power in those days, to Excommunicate so many Churches at his pleasure, without the Authoritative Concurrence of the Presbyters, who sided together with him, that, a long time after, the Bishop of that Church could not so much as ordain a Presbyter, till he got a Licence from the Presbyters.

and Church to do it. Thus *Eusebius* says, (*Eccl. Hist.* . 6. c. 43.) *He, the Bishop of Rome, petitioned them, the Presbytery and Church, that he might be licensed to Ordain this Person only, to wit, Novatianus: ἔλωσε συγχωρεθῆναι αὐτῷ τὸτονμόνον χειροτονῆσαι.* If the Bishop of Rome could not so much as ordain a Presbyter without the Presbytery's Allowance, or Licence from them for that end (by the by, this looks not like Absolute Power, and if there had been nothing in the Case but *Voluntary Condescension, Victor* needed not Petition) much less could he excommunicate so many Churches without their Concurrence and Authority. This Excommunication then of the *Asiatick* Churches was the Deed of the *Roman* Church, Presbytery or Synod, and Bishop *Victor* is said to have Excommunicated them, because he was President of the Presbytery or Synod, because it was by his Perswasion or Instigation that this Excommunication was resolved on or decreed. *Eusebius* then must be understood as if he had spoken thus, *The Roman Presbytery, or Synod, had cut off all the Brethren there from the Communion of the Church.*

Socrates (*Eccl. Hist.* . 1. 6. c. 11.) says, *That Chrysostom was obliged to go to Ephesus to Ordain one Bishop thereof.* Yet by the Canons of the Church, a Bishop was to be ordain'd by all the Bishops of the Province, and his Ordination was not valid unless perform'd by three at least. And he of *Ephesus* was not an ordinary Bishop but Metropolitan of *Asia*, and not an ordinary Metropolitan either, but one who claim'd a Patriarchical Right before the time of the Council of *Chalcedon*, wherefore it is not to be imagined, that he could be ordain'd by *Chrysostom* alone. And says the same Author *ibid.* when they were not like to come to an Agreement in that Affair, *Chrysostom promoted one Heraclides his Son to the Bishoprick.* Will any Person therefore say

say, that *Chrysoftom* alone made that Person Bishop. Must it not be acknowledg'd, that one could not be made Bishop of *Ephesus* without the Authoritative Concurrence of the Bishops of the Province, or three Bishops at least? Wherefore, *Chrysoftom* promoted *Heraclides* to the Bishoprick, is as much as to say, he perswaded the Contending Parties to Agreement in this, or prevail'd with the People to elect *Heraclides*, and the Bishops to ordain him.

And says the same Author, *These also were present whom Chrysoftom put out of their Bishopricks, for he had depos'd many Bishops in Asia, when he went to Ephesus in order to Ordain Heraclides.* Yet a Bishop could not be depos'd but by a Synod, or by twelve Bishops at least. Thus Coun. *Carth.* Anno 418 ordains, *That a Bishop must be judged by twelve Bishops and a Presbyter by six, &c.* And formerly, or some time before this, perhaps a Bishop might not be depos'd but by the Synod of the Bishops of the Province. Thus Coun. *Antioch.* Anno 341. Can. 4. *In case a Bishop being depos'd by a Synod, shall dare to discharge the Functions of his Office before he be restored, he can never hope to be restor'd in another Synod.* In like manner, Can. 14. *In case the Bishops of one Province cannot agree about judging a Bishop, the Metropolis may call the Bishops of another Province to judge and decide this Controversie.* And Can. 15. *If a Bishop condemned unanimously by all the Bishops of the Province cannot be judged anew, but the Sentence of the Synod of the Province ought to remain firm.* Wherefore *Chrysoftom* depos'd many Bishops in *Asia*, is as much as to say, the Synod depos'd them, and *Chrysoftom* is said to have deposed them, because he was Moderator, and set the Synod a-work, perswaded them, or prevail'd with them to depose these Bishops.

T

† A Bishop could not depose a Presbyter by his sole Authority even in the 7. Century, witness the 6. Can. of the 2. Coun: of *Sevil*, in which these words, *That a Bishop alone may indeed confer the Dignity of a Presbyter*

Thus it is said, that *Gregory Nazianzen* (even after he was turn'd out of *Constantinople*, and had no Bishoprick, and consequently, when he was no Bishop, but only a simple Presbyter, according to the 18 Canon of the Council of *Ancyra*, which was more Ancient than the Council of *Nice*) *Εὐλάλιον τινὰ τῆς Ναζιανζῆς ποιμένα κατέστησεν.* i. e. Did constitute one *Eulalius* Pastour, that is, Bishop of *Nazianzum*. That is, Procur'd him to be constitute Bishop of that Church, perswaded the People to Elect, and prevail'd with the Bishops to Ordain him.

This Canon of the Council of *Ancyra* is very remarkable, you have it in the Margine *, according to the Translation of the Learn'd *Du Pin*, 'it forbids Bishops who cannot be receiv'd into their own Bishopricks, to invade those of others, and allows them only to keep the Rank of other Presbyters; of which Honour, it ordains, that they shall be deprived if they stir up Sedition against the Bishop of the place. Hence we may see in the 1st. place, that these are in a great Mistake who fancy, that Bishops are differenced from Presbyters by their Ordination; if Bishops were Bishops by their Or-

E e

di

a Deacon, (that is, may ordain them without the Assistance of other Bishops) but he alone cannot take it away from them to whom he hath given it. What becomes then of the Absolute Power of the Bishop in *Cyprian's* time? This one Canon shot makes terrible Execution, and fearful Havock among *J. S.'s* Arguments taken from *Cyprianick* Phrases, full Assertions, Episcopal Prerogatives, &c. Nay even in the end of the 8th Century, the Council of *Aquileia* in their 7. Can. Forbid Bishops to condemn a Presbyter, an Abbot, or a Deacon, without consulting the Metropolitan. After the death of *Innocentius* Bishop of *Ephesus*, *Chrysostom* went thither, and having assembled a Synod of 70 Bishops, they deposed 6 Bishops who were convicted of giving Money to *Antonius* for their Ordination, and ordain'd the Deacon *Heracleus* Bishop of *Ephesus*.

* *Et si qui Episcopi ordinati sunt, nec recepti ab illa Parochia, in qua fuerint, denominati, voluerintque alias occupare Parochias, & vim praesulatus earum interire, seditiones adversus eos excitando, hos segregari oportet. An autem velint in Presbyterio sedere, in quo prius erant Presbyteri, ipsos, honore non moveri: (εάν μὲν τοῖ βάλουντο εἰς τὸ πρεσβυτέριον καθέζεσθαι-- μὴ ἀποβάλλεσθαι αὐτοὺς τῆς τιμῆς)* *non sibi adversus eos, qui illic constituti sunt, Episcopos, seditiones excitaverint, honorem quoque Presbyterii ab iis auferri (αφαιρεῖσθαι αὐτοῖς καὶ τὴν τιμὴν τῷ πρεσβυτερίῳ)* & illos abdicatos effici.

dination, and were another thing than Presbyters or superior to them by vertue thereof, thir venerable Fathers could never have thought, that a Bishop becomes a meer Presbyter as soon as his Church is destroy'd, or if he cannot get access to his Diocess: A Bishop does not and cannot lose his Ordination by his not getting access to his Diocess, but he loseth his Episcopacy thereby according to this Canon, and becomes a simple Presbyter; there is no inseparable Connexion then between Ordination and Episcopacy, one may have Episcopal Ordination, and yet be nothing but a meer Presbyter; as in the Case instanced by this Canon, *to wit*, Where one who is ordain'd a Bishop, cannot be receiv'd into his Bishoprick thro' some Accident or other, and on the other hand, one may have nothing but Presbyterian Ordination, or be ordain'd by meer Presbyters, and yet be truly a Bishop, as the Bishop of *Alexandria* before the times of *Heraclas* and *Dionysius*: And the verity is, it is no more absurd, that one should be constituted a Bishop by inferior Presbyters, than it is that one be made a Pope by Cardinals, a King by a Parliament, or a General by an Army. In the 2d. place, this Canon doth wonderfully confirm the Idea we gave before of a Bishop and a Presbyter, *viz*. That a Bishop is a constant and a fixed Pastour, who feeds the People of his Charge daily by Preaching of the Word, and Administration of Sacraments: And that a Presbyter is an Officer who has not the Pastoral Charge of any Congregation, but sitteth in the Presbytery and manageth the Discipline of the Church, or Ruleth, and if ever he acteth as a Pastour, he does so now and then only, in an occasional way, and has no Access to preach and administer Sacraments but when invited by the Bishop, or ordered so to do by the Pastour of the Place. A Bishop then he could not get access to his Church or Congregation

gation, was no more a Pastour, had no more access to preach in a constant or stated way, and when he came to any Diocess or Church, had no Access to act as a Pastour, no Access to preach and administer Sacraments, unless invited by the Bishop, or empower'd by the Pastour of the place, and consequently had no Right to do any thing but what a Presbyter could do, and consequently was nothing but a meer Presbyter, as the Fathers of this venerable Council determine most rationally, and very agreeably to common sense. And does not *Optatus Milevitanus* (lib. 2.) speak by way of Mockry of a *Pastor sine grege*, and *Episcopus sine Populo*? In effect he affirms, That one who wants a Flock can no more be a Pastour, and that one who has not a Church can no more be a Bishop, than one can be an Host who has not an House to entertain Strangers in, or a Successor without a Predecessor, a Son without a Father, or the like. *Missus est igitur Victor*, (says he) *erat ibi Filius sine Patre, tiro sine principe, Discipulus sine Magistro, sequens sine antecedente, inquilinus sine domo, hospes sine hospitio, Pastor sine grege, Episcopus sine Populo*. The ancient Presbyters then were not Pastours seing they had not Flocks of their own, but only helped to rule the Bishop's Flock. And if a Bishop hapned to lose his Flock or Congregation, he did thereby cease to be a Bishop, and was in the Rank of a simple Presbyter. Consider here what regard our Prelatical Party has to Antiquity when it suits not with their Interest or Honour, for tho the late Prelates cannot be receiv'd into their Bishopricks, and are *sine Grege*, without Flocks, yet they will have them to be Bishops, and own them as such to this day, trampling on the Authority of this Ancient Council, and despising the Opinion of *Optatus*, that famous African Bishop in the 4. Century. But in the mean time, *Optatus* was in the wrong, and injur'd *Victor Garbensis* the Schismatical Bishop

he is here speaking of, for *Victor* was not without a Flock, he actually had an Episcopal Diocess, and *Optatus* should not have call'd him a Pastour without a Flock, or a Bishop without a People, because his Diocess was only a very small inconsiderable Congregation which us'd to Assemble in a Cave or hole of a Rock, *Speluncam quandam*, says he, *foris a Civitate, gradibus sepeferunt, ubi ipso tempore Conventiculum habere potuissent*, *Optatus* did herein depart from the Fathers who lived before him, and who were greater Men than he, particularly *Tertullian*; *Tertullian* would never have call'd *Victor* a Pastour without a Flock, or a Bishop without a People, who says, (*Exhort. ad Castit. c. 7.*) *Sed & ubi tres, Ecclesia est, licet Laici. i. e.* Where there are three, there is a Church, tho they be Laicks *. Neither did *Cyprian* or *Cornelius* ever pretend, that *Fortunatus* or *Novatianus*, the Schismatical Bishops, were *Pastores sine Grege*, Pastours without a Flock, because their Diocesses were nothing but small Congregations, the one at *Carthage* and the other at *Rome*. Yet *Optatus* did not call *Victor* a Pastour without a Flock, because his Diocess was but one single Congregation, but because it was a very little, naughty, petty, and inconsiderable Congregation, not having a House or Church to Assemble in, like the other Bishops in the World at that time. And it is evident here in the 3d. place, that the *English* Prelates are not and cannot be reckon'd Bishops, whatever ignorant or prejudiced People may fancy. If these were not Bishops, according to the Determination of the venerable Fathers of this Council, *VVho could not be receiv'd into their Bishopricks*, much more are not these Persons Bishops who voluntarily forsake their Bi-

* Our Prelatists have formed to themselves a very strange and monstrous Idea of a Church, nothing is a Church with them but a Diocess consisting of some hundreds or dozens of particular Congregations. You may see here, that *Tertullian* was a stranger to such an Idea of a Church. According to *Tertullian*, a very small Congregation is a Church, and this destroys Prelacy, for in ancient times every Church, tho never so small, had a Bishop.

Bishopricks and live at Court, or are guilty of Non-residence, seing this is a Crime, whereas it was not the Fault of these Persons whom the Council of *Ancyra* reckon'd not to be Bishops, that they were not received into their Bishopricks. The Fathers of this Council thought, that these should not be esteem'd Bishops, who could not be received into their Bishopricks, because they had not access to preach, and administer the Sacraments daily, as constant Pastours. And the *English* Prelates are so far from acting as daily and constant Pastours, that it is but very seldom that they meddle in the Work of Preaching and Administration of the Sacraments, not once or twice perhaps in a Year's time. The *English* Prelates then are not Bishops, they are nothing but simple Presbyters. These were simple Presbyters in the Ancient Times of Christianity, who were taken up about the Government of the Church, and did not preach and administer the Sacraments but rarely, or in an occasional way, or who did not act as constant Pastours in a particular Church or Congregation, feeding the People daily by preaching of the Word and administration of the Sacraments. But the *English* Prelates are taken up principally with managing the Government, do not act as constant Pastours in any particular Church or Congregation, and do not preach and administer the Sacraments daily, but very rarely only, and in an occasional way, and therefore they are nothing but simple Presbyters. True it is, the *English* Prelates may act as constant Pastours, they may, if they please, preach and administer the Sacraments daily as Bishops; but whatever they may be *de facto*, they are nothing but simple Presbyters. And not only Antiquity, but, which is much more, the Scriptures themselves make it evident, that the *English* Prelates are nothing but simple Presbyters. For we must look on these as Bishops, whom the Scriptures determine to be the principal and most honourable Ecclesiastical

stical Officers, and consider these as Presbyters, whom the Scriptures make not so honourable, and less principal Officers. This is evident, because the Bishops were always esteem'd to be the highest and principal ordinary Officers in the Church. But if we judge according to Scripture, we must look on the Pastours of the particular Congregations in *England* as the principal and most honourable, and on the Prelates as the less principal and honourable Officers. This is evident, because we must esteem these to be the principal and most honourable Officers, who are imployed in, and taken up with that Work, which according to Scripture is the principal and most honourable Work of the Ministry; and consider these as the less principal Officers, who are imploy'd in and taken up about the Work that is less principal: But so it is, that the Pastours of the Congregations in *England* are employ'd in that which according to Scripture is the more principal Work of the Ministry, and the Prelates are employ'd in the Work that is reckoned less principal. And this is evident, because the Work of Preaching the Gospel and Administring the Sacraments, is according to Scripture the principal and most honourable Work of the Ministry, and the Work of Ruling is the less principal and honourable Work. And this is evident, because Preaching of the Gospel and Administration of the Sacraments, was the main and principal Work of the Ministry in the Opinion of Christ himself. And that it was so in the Opinion of Christ, is evident, because he specified that, and made no express mention of *Ruling* in his Commission to the Apostles, *Go ye therefore, and teach all Nations, baptizing them in the Name of the Father, Son, and of the Holy Ghost* *. When a Prince

give

* May we not wonder here at the extravagance of these, who pretend that the Prelates are the Successours of the Apostles? They the Successours of the Apostles, who are so very seldom at the Work which lyes in the Commission which our Saviour gave the Apostles! Nothing more ridiculous. They surely are the Successours of the Apostles, who are daily occupied with the Work of preaching the Gospel and baptizing, that is, the Pastours of the Congregations.

gives a Commission, he will specify and make particular mention of that which he reckons the principal Work, the chief Thing to be done. Then the Apostle did sufficiently intimate, that to preach the Gospel was the very principal Thing that Christ gave him in Commission, when he said, *VVo is unto me, if I preach not the Gospel*, and, *Christ sent me not to baptize, but to preach the Gospel*, i. e. Christ did not send me principally for this end, that I might baptize, but that I might preach the Gospel. Seeing then the Bishops are the principal, and the Presbyters the less principal Ecclesiastical Officers: and seeing these are the principal Ecclesiastical Officers, who are employ'd in the principal Work, these the less principal, who are employ'd in the less principal Work of the Ministry: Seeing the Pastours of the Congregations are constantly employ'd in, and taken up with preaching the Gospel and administering the Sacraments, which is the principal Work of the Ministry, and the Prelates are taken up with *Ruling*, which is the less principal Work, it must follow by necessary Consequence, that the Pastours of the Congregations in *England* are the Bishops, and that the Prelates are nothing but simple Presbyters. And this is further evident from what the Apostle saith to *Timothy*, *Let the Elders that rule well be counted worthy of double honour, especially they who labour in the VVord and Doctrine*. It is certain, that the Bishops are the highest and most honourable Officers in the Church, and that next to them are the Presbyters. Wherefore if the Presbyters are worthy of double Honour, the Bishops are worthy of such Honour *especially*. But according to the Apostle, they who labour in the Word and Doctrine, are the Persons that are worthy of double Honour *especially*, and these whose principal work it is to Rule, are not so much worthy of Honour. And seeing it is notoriously evident, that the Pastours of the Paroches

ches or particular Congregations are the Persons that labour in the Word and Doctrine, and that the Prelates do not so (for I hope it will not be said, that they do labour in the Word and Doctrine, and preach in season and out of Season, who preach but once or twice in a Year) but labour in, and are taken up with the Work of Ruling, it is certain, that the Pastours of the Paroches are the true Bishops, who are worthy of double Honour *especially*, and that the *English* Prelates are nothing but meer Presbyters, and if they Rule well, and according to the Prescript of the Gospel, why not? let them be reckon'd worthy of double Honour, according to the Apostolical Canon. From what has been said, it is evident, that they who have any regard to Scripture and Antiquity, must believe, that the *English* Prelates are but simple Presbyters. And if People will not be determined by the concording Suffrages of Scripture and the Fathers, as to this Point, I would fain know what it is that will determine them, and what is the Rule they pretend to walk by? These Persons among us, who are for saying, *We will walk after our own Devices, and we will every one do the Imagination of his own heart*, let the Scriptures & Fathers say what they will, may know, without being at much pains to inquire, what their doom will be at last. We say then, that the Government of the Church of *England* is nothing but Presbyterian Government: For the Government of that Church, which is Ruled by simple Presbyters, is Presbyterian. But a very strange sort of Presbyters these Prelates are, Presbyters who pretend to be the Supreme Ecclesiastical Governours, who have usurped a Tyrannical Power over these who have ascended to the high top of the Priest-hood, Presbyters who Lord it over the Bishops themselves, and have rob'd them of their *Sublimis & Divina Potestas Ecclesiam gubernandi*, who have taken from the Pastours their sublim

an

and Divine Power of Governing the Church. Thir Prelates are not unlike the Deacons in *Jerom's* time, who took upon them to be equal or superiour to the Presbyters. But let us now return again to the Purpose in hand.

The Fathers of an *African* Council in their Letter to Pope *Cælestine*, declare, That according to the Canons of the Council of *Nice*, *The Judgment of Clerks, and even of the Bishops themselves, belongs to the Metropolitan: Et Decreta Nicæna*, say they, *sive inferioris gradus Clericos, sive ipsos Episcopos, suis Metropolitanis apertissime commiserunt.* But it would be as childish to infer hence, that a Metropolitan could by his sole Authority, judge, depose, or excommunicate a Bishop or a Presbyter, as it would be to think, that *Gregory Nazianzen* (when he was but a simple Presbyter) could or did elect *Eulalius*, and ordain him a Bishop, it being evident, by abundance of Canons, that a Bishop or a Presbyter could not be judged or censured in those days, but by a Synod, or a Consistory of many Bishops. What is the Matter then? You may learn from the 85th Canon in the *Codex Ecclesiæ Africanæ*: which gives Power to the Bishop of *Carthage*, i. e. the Metropolitan, to dictate and subscribe *in the Name* of the whole Council, the Letters which the Council thought fit to write and send. *Ut si quæ literæ dictandæ in Concilio placuerint, Venerandus Episcopus, qui huic sedi præsidet, OMNIUM NOMINE dictare, & subscribere dignetur.* The Acts then of the Council went *in the Name* of the Metropolitan. Wherefore, *the Judgment of Clerks, and even of the Bishops themselves, belongs to the Metropolitan*, is as much as to say, *That the Judgment of them belongs to the Synod or Council, or, to the Metropolitan and a convenient Number of Bishops.*

And after the same manner, *the Acts of the Presbytery went in the Bishop's Name*, who was always

President or Moderator. Wherefore, when we read in any Father (as *Cyprian*) or Canons of Councils, that the Bishop did or was to do such a thing, the meaning is no other than this, *The Presbytery did or was to do such a thing*. Thus the forecited Canon of the Council of *Antioch* says, If a Bishop being depos'd by a Synod or a Presbyter or Deacon, *being depos'd by his Bishop*, dare to discharge, &c. Yet, as we have said, a Bishop could not depose either a Presbyter or a Deacon: The meaning then of this Canon is, If a Presbyter or Deacon, *being depos'd by his Bishop and Presbytery*, or, *by his Presbytery & the Neighbouring Bishops who were to join with them*: For in those days, five or six Bishops join'd the Presbytery, when they were to judge a Presbyter, and two or three if a Deacon was to be judged. Thus

The 8th Canon of the Council of *Carth*: under the Consulship of *Cæsarius* and *Atticus*, regulates the Number of Bishops that are absolutely requir'd to the Judging a Presbyter and a Deacon, and requires five at least to the Judging a Presbyter, and two for Judging a Deacon, and adds, That as to others of the Faithful, the Bishop of the Place may take Cognisance of them, *and judge them alone*. *Reliquorum autem causas etiam solus Episcopus loci agnoscat & finiat*. But the meaning is not, that the Bishop of the Place might judge private Christians alone, that is, by his *sole Authority*, without the Authoritative Concurrence of the Presbytery: For this would flatly contradict the Practice of the Universal Church till then, and some hundreds of Years after, and even this Canon made by themselves, *viz. Let the Bishop do nothing without the Clergy*, or Presbytery, *and the Sentences which he shall give without the Clergy, shall be null and void*. And the English Doctors themselves will not allow us to say

say, that their Bishops have a sole Power *. Wherefore, *The Bishop of the Place may judge them alone*, is as much as to say, *The Presbytery may judge them*, or, their own Bishop and Presbytery may judge them, without being oblig'd to call to their Assistance, either five or two Neighbouring Bishops, as they must when they are to judge a Presbyter or a Deacon. *A pari* then, when the Canons say, that a Deacon must be judged by three or two Bishops, a Presbyter by five or six, and a Bishop by twelve; the meaning is, and can be no other than this, *They shall be judged by their own Presbytery, having such a respective Number of Neighbouring bishops concurring with them, or assisting them.*

Thus also the 8th Canon Council: *Carth: An: 390.* declares, *That if a Presbyter excommunicated by his own Bishop, set up Altar against Altar, &c.* And the 10 Can: of the very same Council ordains, *That a Bishop accus'd who would justify himself, ought at least to defend his Cause before 12 Bishops, and a Presbyter before 6, and a Deacon before 3.* You see, that by this Canon a Bishop could not excommunicate a Presbyter; yet the 8th Canon says, *If a Presbyter excommunicated by his own Bishop.* Wherefore it is evident, that the Act of the Judicatory went in the Bishop's Name, and the meaning is, *If a Presbyter excommunicated by his own Presbytery, and their Assistants at the time, &c.*

In like manner the Council of *Sardica An: 347,* in Can: 19, declares, *That the Ordination of a Clergy-man, of another Diocess, ought to be void, and that the Bishop who does it, ought to be punished †.*

F f 2

And

* Says J. S. (*Vindic: p. 125.*) Do not I say, That a Bishop in St. Cyprian's Time had the sole Power of Ordination? I said so, but where did I say, he had the sole Power of Jurisdiction?

† This Canon of the Council of *Sardica* is thus in the *Latine Edition*, *Et hoc universi constitutum, ut quicumque ex alia Parochia voluerit alienum Ministrum sine consensu Episcopi ipsius & sine voluntate ordinare, non sit rata Ordinatio ejus. Quicumque autem hoc usurpaverit, a fratribus & Coepiscopis nostris & admoneri debet, & corrigi. Et Conc: Arausic: Can: 8 & 9. Si quis tibi consentientem Clericum Ordinandum putaverit, prius definiat, ut cum ipso habitet, &c. Si qui autem alienos, Civis, aut alibi consentientes ordinaverint, &c.*

And Council: of *Orange* An: 441, Forbids a Bishop to ordain one belonging to another Diocess. But the Ordination, at least of a Presbyter, was the Act of the Presbytery and Bishop as President, and the Bishop never ordain'd alone, according to this Canon of one of the Councils of *Carthage*, *At the Ordination of a Presbyter, all the other Presbyters shall lay their hands on his head, while the Bishop consecrates him, and lays hands on him.* The meaning then of thir Canons must be, *That a Bishop & Presbytery ought to be punished,* who ordain one belonging to another Diocess. Thus you see, that the Acts both of Ordination and Jurisdiction, are spoken of as the Bishop's Acts, tho really they were the Church's or Presbytery's Acts.

And the 10th Canon of the first Council: of *Orange* ordains, That if a Bishop erect a Church within the Territories of another Bishop, it shall be consecrated by the Bishop of the Place, and says, *Et omnis Ecclesiæ ipsius Gubernatio ad eum (viz. Episcopum) in cujus Civitatis territorio Ecclesia surrexerit, pertinebit,* i. e. The Government of that Church shall belong to the Bishop and Presbytery of the Place. For that the Government then was managed by the Presbytery and Bishop as Moderator thereof, is what cannot be denied, as would be very easy to make appear. And hundreds of Examples of this kind might be produced, if it were needful.

Now this was the way of wording things at that time, and the current Language once in a day both at *Athens* and *Rome*. Thus after the *Athenians* had decreed the *Sicilian War*, *Nicias* one of the Generals, judging that would prove a dangerous Expedition, and ruinous to the Common-wealth, and exhorting them to rescind that Decree, expresses himself in a publick Oration thus: *And you O Prytani or President, (if you think it belongs to your Office to look to the Advantage of the Republick, and if you desire to be accounted a good Citizen) Vote these thing*

over again *, or rescind that Decree. That is, put these things to the Vote again, that the People may rescind that Decree.

And *Titus Livius* says, That *C. Oppius* the Tribune made that Law in the time of the greatest Heat of the Punic War, when *Q. Fabius*, and *T. Sempronius* were Consuls †. *Oppius* made that Law, that is, propos'd that Law to the People, and induced them to enact it, or presided when it was made, and gathered the Votes or Suffrages.

It

* Καὶ σὺ ὡ πρύτανι ταυτα (ἔπειρ ἡγῆ σοὶ προσηκῆν ἡδεὺς τε τῆς πόλεως, καὶ βελὴ γένεσθαι πολίτης ἀγαθός) ἐπιψήριζε, &c. (*Thucyd.* l. 6. Sect. 14.) id est, dicit Scholiast. Ἀτέρως ψήφους τίθει.

† Tulerat eam Legem C. Oppius Tribunus Plebis, Q. Fabio & T. Sempronio fr. in medio ardore Punico belli. Thus also *Dion.* (*Assius Lib.* 36. A Law was made by the Consuls (ἐνομοθετήθη πρὸς αὐτῶν τῶν ὑπάτων) wit, against these who procur'd Offices by Bribery, &c. And a little after he says, That *Manilius* decreed *Pompey* to be General in the War against *Tigres* and *Mitribidates*, and made him Governour of *Bitbynia* and *Asia* (τὴν τε Βιθυνίαν καὶ τὴν Κιλικίαν ἀμαρχὴν αὐτῶν προσεταξεν) that is, *Manilius* presided when the Roman People did so, or moved them to it. And again says he, *Caius quidam Cornelius Tribus Plebis intenderat gravissimas statuere pœnas* (πικρότατα ἐπιτί-ατάξαι) in eis qui ambitus rei essent. And again, *Cornelius Plebis statum cernens, antequam quicquam decrevisset* (πρὶν ἐπιψήφισαι τὴν πρόνοιαν) dimisit. *Ibid.* That is, he dismissed the Assembly before he call'd the People to give their Suffrages. And to the same purpose *Demosth.* *Orat. in Philipp.* *Ego profecto dicam atque etiam decernam, i. e. Ostendam quomodo appeti.* *Placuit Senatui opem tantis ferre Supplicibus, viz. Atbeniensibus.* *Titus Liv.* 1. 2. c. 7. Et cum aliquot prius bene adversum Caribaginenfes pugnet, Successorq; ei a Senatu prospere bellum gerenti non mitteretur, &c. *Ibid.* *Epit.* l. 18. *Tit. Liv.* Will it follow hence, that the People us'd not to meddle in such Affairs, and had no Power to send a Successor to him? *Antis Gracchorum legibus ita vehementer incuhuit* [*Appuleius*] *ut Senatui quoque cogeret in verba jurare, cum abnuentibus aqua & igni interdictum se minaretur.* *Ibid.* l. 3. c. 17. Was therefore *Appuleius* an absolute monarch? Nothing like it. The meaning is, That he would procure such Order from the People, and thus forced the Senate by his Threatnings. *Cicero*, *Iidem inquam ego recreavi afflictos animos bonorum, unumquemque* *rumans, excitans, infellendis vero exagitantibusque Nummaris Judiciis,* *omnibus studiis ac fautoribus illi Vulturi parrhesiam eripui:* *Consulem nulla in re consistere unquam sum passus, desponsam biniiri* *Syriam adem:* *Senatum ad pristinam suam severitatem revocavi, atque* *um excitavi: Clodium præsentem fregi in Senatu.* *Ad Attic.* l. 1. *Ep.* Certainly it is a pity, that *Cicero* was not a Bishop; a great deal for absolute Power might have been made out of this Sentence, and many others of this kind that might be instanced; Yet *Cicero* was no Monarch more than a byerian Moderator.

It is well known, that the Magistrates of *Athens* were elected by the People, Cheirotioniz'd or Elect-ed by their Suffrages, or else by their Lots; at *Rome*, in like manner, the Power of Elections was lodged in the People or Body of the Common-wealth: Yet the *Thesmothetæ* were said to Cheirotionize the Magistrates, or to Elect them by their Suffrages, or to choose them by Lots, and the *Roman* Tribunes or Consuls were said to Cheirotionize or Elect the Magistrates there: Not that either the *Tribunes* or *Thesmothetæ* elected the Magistrates by their own Suffrages, but because they presided at the Elections and gathered the Suffrages of the People. Thus *Calvin*, *Sic Romani Historici non raro loquuntur, Consulem qui Comitia habuerat creasse novos Magistratus non aliam ob causam, nisi quia suffragia receperat, & Populum moderatus est in eligendo.* Wherefore, the *Thesmothetæ* choosed the Magistrates by their Lots is as much as to say, that they presided when the Magistrates were chosen, or guided the Action, and the *Tribunes* Cheirotionized the Magistrates, as much as to say, that they presided at the Action, Cheirotionized or elected the Magistrates by the Suffrages of the People. And thus *Paul* and *Barnabas* Cheirotionized or elected the Presbyter (*Acts* 14. 23.) that is, presided when the People elected them, or elected them by the Suffrages of the People, as the proper signification of the word *χειροτονισαντες* importeth. The *English* Translation of the Bible is not right then in this place where we are speaking of, whereas *Luke's* words are rendered, *And when they had ordained them Elders in every Church, they should have been Translated thus, And when they had by the Suffrages of the People created them Elders in every Church, or Presbyters.* The *French* Version is much truer than the *English*, wit, *Et apres que par l'avis des Assemblees ils eurent etabli des Anciens par chaque Eglise.*

Weak then and frivolous is the Objection made by Bishop *Stillingsfleet* (*Iren.* p. 27. and which the Prelatists have ordinarily in their mouth) *Granting* *used*, says he, *in the primary signification of the word*, *let it cannot be applied to the People, but to Paul and Barnabas, for it is not said, that the People did Cheirotonein, but that Paul and Barnabas did Cheirotonein.* Now wherever that word is used in its first signification, it is implied to be the Action of the Persons themselves giving Suffrages, and not for other Persons appointing by the Suffrages of others. Says the Bishop, it is not said, that the People themselves did, but that Paul and Barnabas did Cheirotonein. That is very true, but what then? The word implieth, says he, that the Persons themselves give the Suffrages, or elect, who are said Cheirotonein. That is a manifest untruth. The *Thesmothetæ* were said to choose the Magistrates by Lots, *Ἀρχὰς δὲ φήσκειν ἐκείνας εἶναι οἱ Θεσμοθέται ἀποκληρῶσιν ἐν τῷ Θυσίῳ, Sc. scilicet. Orat. contra Ctesiph. § 7.* that is, They call Magistrates whom the *Thesmothetæ* choose by Lot in the Temple of *Theseus*. Yet the Act of choosing the Magistrates by Lot, was the People's Act, and the *Thesmothetæ* only presided, or guided the Election, and declared who the Persons were on whom the Lot did fall. And as to the Magistrates who were chosen by the Cheirotomia, or Elective Votes, the *Thesmothetæ* were said *Cheirotonein*, and at Rome, the Tribunes were said *Cheirotonein*, or to elect them by their Suffrages. Thus *Fuli. Pollux*, b. 8. c. 6.) says, that the *Thesmothetæ* did *καὶ ἄλλων δικαστὰς, καὶ ἀθλοθέτας ἐνα κατὰ φυλὴν ἐκάστην στρατηγῶς χειροτονεῖν ἐξ πάντων. i. e.* They choose Judges by Lot, and Arbiters, one of each Tribe, and Cheirotonize (*i. e.* Elect by Suffrages of the People) Generals out of any Tribe. And *Appian* (*de Bell. civil. l. 1.*) says of the Tribune *Sulpitius*, *ἐκύβηον τὸν νόμον, καὶ εὐθὺς Μάριον ἔχα-*

ἔχειρότονει τῷ πρὸς Μιθριδάτη πολέμῳ στρατηγῶν ἀντὶ Σύλλα. *i. e.* He confirm'd (that) Law, and forthwith Cheirotoniz'd (*i. e.* presided when the People did elect) *Marius* General in the War against *Mithridates*, in the room of *Sylla* †. And says the same Author (*De Bell. civ. lib. 2.*) Δημάρχως δὲ ἤξειτο Οὐατίνιον τε καὶ Κλώδιον. *i. e.* He elected (*i. e.* presided when the People did elect) *Vatinius* and *Clodius*, Tribunes.

In like manner, it is very ordinary to say, that Officers or Magistrates appointed things, which they could not appoint but by the Suffrages of others, that is, the People. Thus *Æsch.* τίς ἦν ὁ ταῦτα γράψας καὶ τίς ὁ ταῦτα ἐπιψηφίσας προεδρος. *i. e.* Who it was that proposed these things, and what President decreed them: But the President could not decree but by the Suffrages of others, the meaning then is, *Who was President when the People decreed these things by their Suffrages.* And says *Demosth. de Coro.* ἐθήκα νόμον καθ' ὃν τὸ μὲν τὰ δίκαια ποιεῖν ἠνάγκασα τὸ πλεσίς, τὸ δὲ πενήτας ἔπαυσα ἀδικεῖντες. *that is,* I made a Law whereby I forced the Rich to do just things, and delivered the Poor from being injured: And a little after he says, *Ego venanivum præfecturas a tenuioribus hominibus transtuli a locupletiores:* But none of these things could *Demosthenes* do but by the Suffrages of the People

An

† When the Tribunes presided, the People's Suffrage or Cheirotonia, was call'd the Cheirotonia of the Tribunes. καὶ τῆς δὲ τῶν Δημάρχων τῆς χειροτονίας προεστώτα. *i. e.* President of the Cheirotonia of the Tribunes. And when the Consuls presided, the Suffrage of the People was call'd the Suffrage or Cheirotonia of the Consuls. πρὸς δεισις δὲ ὑπάτων χειροτονίας. *Appian. de Bell. Civ. l.* And to the same purpose, *App: ibid: l. 2.* Αἰρεθέντες δ' ἔν ὑπαι τοι Κραῶς καὶ Πομπηίος Καίσαρι μὲν ὅσα ἐπεσησαν ἕτεραν πενταετία. *Cæsari aliud quinquennium creverunt.* Here the People's Decree or Psephisma, is call'd the Psephism of the Consuls.

And any Proposal that he might make, had not the Force of a Decree till it got the People's *Psephismā*, or was ratified by their Suffrages; yet he says in this same Oration, That *Phillip* of *Macedon* got *Thrace* brought under his Subjection, through the negligence of the *Athenian* Ambassadors who obey'd not his Decree, ἔχῃ παιδέντας τῷ ἐμῷ ὑψηλίσματι, *Demosthenes* then made that Decree by the Suffrages of the People. And after this manner did *Mamilius* the *Roman* Tribune decree *Pompey* to be General in the War against *Tigranes* and *Mitridates*, and make him Governour of *Bithynia* and *Cilicia*, *Dion. lib. 3. 6.* The same way, *that is*, by the Suffrages of the People, *Cæsar* being Consul, ratified and confirmed *Pompey's* Actings or Administrations in the Government, as says the same *Dion. lib. 38.* πρῶτον μὲν τὰ πραχθέντα ὑπὸ τοῦ Πομπηίου πάντα, μήτε τῷ Λικυλλῷ, μήτ' ἄλλῃ τινὸς ἀντιστάμενος, ἐβεβίωσεν. In like manner, *Aristotle* says, that *Solon* did τὴν δημοκρατίαν καταστήσαι, Constitute the Democracy, yet *Solon* had no Absolute Power, was neither Prince nor Monarch, the Democracy was established by the Authority of the People, and 'tis said that *Solon* did it, because he contrived the Model, proposed, advised, &c. he constituted the Democracy by the Suffrages of the *Athenians*. To the same purpose, *Isocrates* in *Areopag.* ἡν ἐβελήσωμεν κείνην τὴν δημοκρατίαν ἀναλαβεῖν, ἣν Σόλων μὲν, ὁ δημοτικωτάτος γενόμενος, ἐνομοθέτησε. *that is*, If we be for such a Democracy as *Solon*, who was most zealous for Democratical Government, did constitute by his Laws. And also *Dionysius Halicarnassius* who says, ἀνασωζαὶς δὲ τὴν ὑπὸ Σόλωνος τε καὶ Κλεισθέως καταθεθεῖσαν πολιτείαν. *i. e.* To keep up that Policy or Form of Government which was constituted by *Solon* and *Cleisthenes*. *In vit. Isocr.* Now by these Examples it is most evident, that it is an ordinary thing to say, That Persons appoint such

or such things, which they appoint by the Suffrages of others, and that it is ridiculous to pretend, that the People did not elect the Presbyters or Elders, (*Acts* 14. 23.) because *Paul* and *Barnabas* were said *Cheirotonein*.

But, says the Learn'd Prelate in the same place, tho the word *Cheirotonein* did originally signify *Choosing by way of Suffrage*, yet before the times of *Luke*, it was us'd for *simple Designation*, and in *Demosthenes* it sometimes signifies to *Decree and Appoint*, and that sense of the word appears in *St. Luke* himself, *Acts* 10. 41. It cannot be denied, that to choose by *Popular Suffrages*, or, to appoint and decree by *Votes or common Consent*, is the original and proper Signification of this word, and if it be taken in an improper sense sometimes, what then? how many words are there which are taken in an improper sense now and there if a word once be taken in an improper sense, must it never be taken in a proper sense again at all, or understood in its natural signification? The Bishop insinuates, That seeing this word is taken in an improper sense sometimes, it may be so taken in the 23 v. of this 14 ch. of the *Acts*, and consequently cannot be proven from that Text of Scripture, that the People choosed their own Pastours. To this I say, 1. That we must never depart from the proper and natural signification of the word, unless we be necessitated by something in the Context or from other part of Scripture, if we may fly to an improper sense, whenever the proper sense suits not with our humour, contradicts our Hypothesis, or crosses our Interest, we will make the Scriptures a *No of Wax*: But there is nothing in the Context, or any other place of Scripture, to force us to depart from the proper signification of the word here; the Learn'd Bishop has not made it appear, that it will either contradict Scripture or Reason, if we adhere to the proper sense, and this is what cannot

be made to appear, and therefore there is a necessity of adhering to the proper signification of the word in this place. 2. If we depart from the proper signification of this word here, and say, that *Paul* and *Barnabas* themselves elected the Elders or Presbyters, we will set the Scripture at variance with Scripture, and cause *Paul* and *Barnabas* contradict the whole College of the Apostles; for when one was to be substituted in the room of *Judas*, and two Persons were to be chosen, that one of them might be put into the Apostolical Office by Lot, the Apostles themselves did not pitch upon the two, but referred the Election of them to the People, *Acts* 1. in like manner, *Acts* 6. the Apostles put it on the People to elect the Seven Deacons: And if the Apostles would not take upon them so much as to elect the Deacons, what probability is there, that *Paul* and *Barnabas* would choose the Bishops or Presbyters, and by this means rob the Churches of the Prerogative which the Practice of the Apostles at *Jerusalem* gave them ground to claim to, and which they might justly claim as a Right, naturally belonging to all Societies? The Election of the Ecclesiastical Officers is the principal thing in the whole External Administration of the Kingdom of Jesus Christ in this World, and the Basis or Foundation of the Discipline of the Church; wherefore it is very requisite, that the Churches know the mind of Christ with respect thereto; and seeing the Mind of Christ is to this Point is no where intimated in Scripture but by the Practice of the Apostles, if Apostolical Practice be found to vary with respect thereto, as it will certainly, if it be suppos'd that *Paul* and *Barnabas* elected, how can the Churches come to any knowledge of the Mind of Christ thereby? If the Trumpet give an uncertain Sound, who shall prepare himself to the Battel? What shall the Churches do then, supposing that *Paul* and *Barnabas* elected? if

they follow the Example of these two, they will condemn the Practice of the whole Consistory of the Apostles at *Jerusalem*, they will condemn *James* and *Cephas*, and *John*, who were the Pillars of the Church, and if they follow the Example of the Consistory of the Apostles at *Jerusalem*, they will condemn the great Apostle of the Gentiles. But pray, why should the Apostles be thus set at Variance among themselves, and the Churches left to such Uncertainties as to the Mind of Christ about this Weighty and Cardinal Point? For no Reason at all. The Prelatists are not able to produce so much as the shadow of a Reason to justify their Gloss, or to prove that *Cheirotonein* should be taken in an improper sense in this place, only they would fain have us to believe, that not the People, but *Paul* and *Barnabas* elected the Elders, but for what Reason I know not; for tho they did, that would not justify Patronages, or the manner of electing Bishops and Pastours in *England*. Wherefore it is evident, that *Cheirotonein* must be taken in the proper or popular sense, and it cannot be said, that *Paul* and *Barnabas* elected the Presbyters, without manifest resisting the Spirit of God. 3. If this word, we are speaking of, be not taken in the popular sense, *Paul* and *Barnabas* will be made to contradict the Practice of the Church Universal, it being so evident, that the People elected their Pastours for several hundred Years after the departure of the Apostles, that none will deny it excepting these who are ignorant or disingenuous; Nevertheless, the Prelatists themselves affirm, that the Practice of the Universal Church is the best Commentary upon Scripture, wherefore if they will affirm that *Paul* and *Barnabas* elected, they must say, That the Practice of the Universal Church is the best Commentary, providing it make for their Interest; but if it be contrary to their Interest, then it is a bad Commentary on Scripture, and must be carefully rejected. 4. If this word be not taken

in the sense we are speaking of, *Paul* and *Barnabas* must be suppos'd to have acted contrary to common sense; if they elected, it will follow, that Bishops should be elected by other Bishops, but that would be contrary to common sense as much as if Kings were elected by Kings, or Mayors by Mayors, as will appear more evidently afterward.

The Bishop tells us in the next place, that this word may import no more but laying on of hands *, and refers us to *Bilson*, who proves by large Quotations, that it is taken in this sense by several Ecclesiastical Authors. If this word changed its signification at length after Alterations were made in the Discipline, and new Methods began to be introduced, what then? this is what has happened to many other words. But we must look on that as the meaning of the Holy-Ghost, which the word did naturally and currantly signify at the time, and not any fantastical Signification that might be given to it in After-generations. Must the words *Acts* 13. 2. be rendered, *When they were saying Mass*, or, *offering Sacrifice to the Lord*, because the word *λειτεργεῖν* came at length to signify some such thing among Christians? In *England* the word *Bishop* signifies one who is a Pastour of many hundred Congregations, and sits in Parliament, and manages the Discipline by Chancellor, Sub-chancellor, and such Officers, will it therefore follow, that *Ἐπίσκοπος* may be taken in that sense in the Writings of *Paul* or *Ignatius*? Then

Cheirotonoe properly signifies to choose with hands lifted up, or stretch forth; when Assemblies for choosing of Magistrates were to be keep'd, they appointed one whom they thought the most fit for that Dignity, and laying produced him on the Theatre, his Name was proclaim'd by a Cry, and it was said, To whomsoever this seems good let him lift up his hand, and then such as approv'd of the Election, by lifting up of hands, testified that the Man elected seem'd to them a fit Man to bear the Office of a Magistrate, but they who disprov'd it, kept in their hand, which Party soever the greater Number had the Election decreed accordingly. Hence came that word *Cheirotonoe*, and he who became Magistrate by such Suffrage was call'd *Cheirotonetor*. This *Elias* the *Cretian* doth testify upon *Nazianzen's* Oration. And *Zonaras* upon the Canons of the Apostles teacheth us, that at first the word *Cheirotonia* did signify the Suffrages, but afterwards (the ancient Rites being abolished) was us'd for Consecration. *Du Veil* on

Then says he, ' It seems strangely improbable, that
 ' the Apostles should put the Choice at that time in-
 ' to the hands of the People, when there were none
 ' fitted for the Work the Apostles designed them
 ' for, but whom the Apostles did lay their hands on,
 ' by which the Holy-Ghost fell upon them, where-
 ' by they were fitted and qualified for that Work :
 ' The People then could no wise choose Men for their
 ' Abilities, when their Abilities were consequent to
 ' their Ordination. But so far is that from being
 strangely improbable, that the Evangelist *Luke* gives
 us Account, that the Apostles actually did so, they
 actually put the Choice of *Mattbias* and *Barsabas*, and
 the seven Deacons in the hands of the People. And
 why this so very improbable, Because, says he, none
 then were fitted for the Work the Apostles designed
 them for, but whom the Apostles did lay their hands
 on, by which the Holy-Ghost fell upon them. But
 this which made the Bishop fancy it was strangely
 improbable that the Apostles should put the Electi-
 ons in the hands of the People, tho *Luke* affirms it
 expressly, was a gross Mistake, these whom the Peo-
 ple elected to the Office of Deacons, *Acts 6.* had the
 Holy-Ghost, and were qualified for the Work they
 were designed for, antecedently to the laying on o
 the hands of the Apostles, as is evident from the 3
 and 6. Verses of that Chapter compar'd together
Look ye out among you seven Men of honest Report, full
of the Holy-Ghost and Wisdom, say the Apostles to
 the People : The laying on of the hands of the A-
 postles was after the Election of the People, if the
 the Abilities of Persons and the Holy-Ghost's fall-
 ing on them, was Consequent to their Ordinat-
 on or the laying on of the Apostles hands, how coul
 they desire the People to elect seven Men *full of the*
Holy-Ghost and of Wisdom? and seing the Deacon
 were full of the Holy-Ghost antecedently, either t
 their Election or Ordination, why might not mar

be so, who were elected to the Episcopal Office? In a word, what he says here has no weight at all; for granting it to be true, it will not make it in the least improbable that the Elections were put in the hands of the People; Christ could qualify Persons for the Ministry whatever way they were elected, whether by the People or by the Apostles. But to return.

The foresaid *Nicias* finding, that he could not by his Speeches divert the *Athenians* from the *Sicilian War*, *Thucydides* says, He imagined he could soon cause them alter their Resolutions, if he should lay on a great Subsidy, or command great Preparations to be made, *Nicias vero cum animadvertisset fore, ut non amplius eisdem rationibus (quas prius attulerat, ipsos a proposito) revocaret, sed apparatus magnitudine, magnum apparatus ipsi imperaret, fortasse ipsos de sententia deduceret, Thuc. l. 6. § 19.* But the meaning is, and can be no other than this, If he could make it appear to the People, that such a War could not be carried on without vast Preparation, the Government of *Athens* being Democratical, so that, If he should command great Preparations to be made, is as much as to say, If he should make it appear to the People, that they would be necessitated to command great Preparations to be made: Thus *Thucydides* says, (*ibid. § 25.*) *Indem quidam ex Atheniensibus in medium progressus, & Nicias adhortatus dixit, non oportere eum amplius tergiversari, sed in omnium conspectu jam declarare, quemnam apparatus ab Atheniensibus sibi decerni vellet.* When we come to put such a gloss as this on some *Cyprian's* Sentences, *F, S.* will storm no doubt and cry out mightily, but we must set the Truth before the People, let him say what he will.

Certainly *F, S.* has heard of *Lex Julia, Pompeia, Acinia, Porcia, Acilia, &c.* Were therefore these laws made by the Authority of one single Person? No such thing, they were enacted by the Authority of the *Roman People*, and were call'd the Laws of such

such persons, because the Persons presided at the making of them, or moved and perswaded the making of them.

And no more will it follow, that the Canons of Councils were made by the Bishops alone, excluding the Presbyters, because they were call'd the Decrees of the Bishops, and not the Decrees of the Bishops and Presbyters, than it will follow, that such a Law was made by *Pompey* or *Acolius* alone, excluding the Senate and People of *Rome*, because it was call'd *Lex Acilia*, and not *Lex Acilii & Populi Romani*. The Canons of Councils were call'd, the Decrees of the Bishops, not because the Presbyters did not concur Authoritatively in making them, but because the Bishops were the principal Members of the Synods; and the Denomination is oft times taken from the principal part. *Alcibiades*, *Nicias* and *Lamachus*, commanded the *Athenian Army* that went upon the *Sicilian Expedition*; but did that Army consist of *Athenians* only, because call'd the *Athenian Army*? If you consult *Thucydides*, you will, may be, find, that scarce the one half were *Athenians*, but *Argives*, *Ghians*, *Mantineans*, and other Confederates.

Cyprian says, As for others of the Lapsers, they must wait till Bishops may meet in Council, and determine about them; he says not, till Bishops and Presbyters may meet in Council and determine. Hence *J. S.* concludes, that the Bishops alone did determine in Councils. But *J. S.* himself confesseth, that the Presbyters did meet in Councils as well as the Bishops, tho they had no decisive Voice in them, as he fancies: Wherefore we must not infer, that the Bishops alone did meet in Council without the Presbyters, because *Cyprian* says, *They must wait till Bishops meet in Council*, and not till *Bishops and Presbyters meet in Council*: How can it be concluded then, that the Bishops alone did determine

in Councils, because *Cyprian* says, *Till Bishops determine about them, and not, Till Bishops and Presbyters determine about them?*

The great Council at *Antioch*, which condemned *Paulus Samosatenus*, did not consist of Bishops alone, but of Bishops and Presbyters, and Deacons too. Thus *Eusebius* (*Hist: Eccl: l. 7. c. 28.*) says, *Sexcentos quoque alios, qui una cum Presbyteris & Diaconis eo confluerunt, nequaquam difficile fuerit recensere.* But says *J. S.* The Presbyters did meet not to determine, but to be present as Witnesses of what passed, or to deliver their Opinion, give Advice, &c. Who knows not that there is a notable, a material difference between a *Voice deliberative*, and a *Voice decisive*? So that the Bishops alone did meet to decide or determine. But *J. S.* is in a gross mistake, *Eusebius* tells us expressly, that the Presbyters did meet at *Antioch*, τῆς αὐτῆς ἐκκλησίας, for the same Cause or End that the Bishops did meet there, *that is*, to decide or determine, to judge and condemn *Paulus Samosatenus*. And this is further evident from their Synodical Epistle, which *Eusebius* gives account of Chap: 30. The Inscription is thus, *Dionysio & Maximo, & omnibus per universum Orbem Comministris nostris, Episcopis, Presbyteris & Diaconis, & Universæ Ecclesiæ Catholicæ quæ sub Cælo est, Helenus & Hymenæus, &c. & reliqui omnes qui nobiscum sunt vicinarum Urbium & Provinciarum Episcopi, Presbyteri ac Diaconi, & Ecclesiæ Dei, Carissimis Fratribus in Domino Salutem.* Then having given account of several Crimes that *Paulus* was guilty of, they add, *Hunc igitur (Paulum) Deo bellum indicentem nec cedere volentem, cum a Communione nostra abdicassemus, &c.* *Paulus* then was depos'd and excommunicated not only by the Bishops, but by the Presbyters in that Council, and therefore it is certain, that they had a *decisive Voice* together with the Bishops. And *Cyprian* says (*Ep: 71.*) that not only Bishops, but

Presbyters determined in a Synod concerning Heretical Baptisms, *De qua re quid nuper in Concilio plurimi Coepiscopi, cum Compresbyteris qui aderant, Censuerimus, i. e. decreverimus.*

I shall not deny, that the Presbyters were at length excluded from acting in Councils, but they were not excluded in Cyprian's time, nor some hundred Years after. Thus Pope Felix the third, presiding in the Council at Rome (Anno 487.) consisting of 38 Bishops, and 76 Presbyters, and directing his Discourse to them, said, *De quo quid observari debeat, ordinare nos convenit.* And Pope Zacharie presided in a Council at Rome, about the middle of the eighth Centurie, which was composed of 40 Bishops and 22 Presbyters; and the Records of that Council begin thus, *Zacharias Sanctissimus ac beatissimus Episcopus sedis Apostolicæ, cum omnibus Episcopis Presbyteris & Diaconibus, Domino volente & auxiliante, ita decrevit qualiter singulis Capitulis nunc subter declaratur.* And the Acts of the Council at Rome, in which Anastasius the Cardinal Presbyter, was depos'd, and which was holden after the middle of the ninth Centurie, are subscribed by 67 Bishops, 19 Presbyters, and 6 Deacons.

Now, I think no more needs be said to make it appear, that the Presbyters had decisive Voices in Provincial Synods for many hundred Years after the departure of the Apostles; wherefore by all Rules of Government they should have had decisive Voices in the more General or National Assemblies also, and if they had not, so much the more unaccountable was the Conduct of the Church-Rulers in those days. However, J. S. mistook his measures, when he concluded, that they had no decisive Voices, because the Canons us'd to be call'd the Canons or Decrees of the Bishops, or because Cyprian said, *Till Bishops meet in Council, and determine about them, &c.*

And in like manner, tho' *Cyprian* says to *Rogatianus*, that he might have depos'd or excommunicated his Rebellious Deacon, being assur'd, that the Synod would have ratified that Act of his Discipline, it will no more follow, that that Bishop did, or could alone depose the Deacon, than it will follow, that *Chrysoftom* alone made *Heraclides* Bishop of *Ephesus*, elected and ordain'd him, excluding the Bishops and People; or than it will follow, that he depos'd many Bishops in *Asia* by his sole Authority, excluding the Synod or Bishops of the Province, because *Socrates* says, *He depos'd many Bishops in Asia when he went to Ephesus*: or than it will follow, that *Demosthenes* by his own Authority made Laws, binding the whole Common-wealth, because he said, *ἐχὶ πειθέντας τῷ ἐμῷ ὑποσίματι*. If a Bishop could not depose a Deacon in the fifth Century, as is evident by the Canons, how ridiculous is it to imagine, that he could by his Absolute Power depose one even in *Cyprian's* time? Seeing it is notoriously known, that the Power of the Bishops did grow with time, and was much increas'd rather than diminish'd in the fifth Century. *Chrysoftom* depos'd many Bishops in *Asia* then, is as much as to say, that the Synod, whereof *Chrysoftom* was Moderator, depos'd them: *Demosthenes's* saying, *Who did not obey my Psephisma*, is as much as to say, *Who did not obey the People's Psephisma*, &c? In like manner *Cyprian's* saying to *Rogatianus*, *Thou mayst use the Power of thine Honour either by deposing or excommunicating him*, is as much as to say, *You might have got that Deacon depos'd by your Presbytery, and need not have had recourse to the Authority of the Synod for that end; and if you and your Presbytery had deposed him, you may be sure, your Colleagues, or the Synod would have ratified that Act of your Discipline. So that, the Vigour of the Episcopacy was nothing but the Church's Vigour, or the Vi-*

gour of the Power of the Presbytery, and, *the Authority of the Chair*, the Authority of the Court or Judicatory, wherein the Bishop did sit in a conspicuous Chair as Moderator. If it be ask'd, why did *Cyprian* appropriate the Power of the Church to *Rogatianus*, or call the Authority of the Presbytery his Authority, and the Vigour of his Episcopacy? I ask, Why did *Livius* appropriate the Power of the *Roman* People to a Tribune, or say, that *Oppius* made a Law, when that Law was made by the People of *Rome*? Why did *Socrates* say, that *Chrysostom* depos'd these Bishops in *Asia*, who were deposed by the Synod? Or, that he promoted *Heractides* to the Episcopal Chair of *Ephesus*, tho' he was promoted to it by the Call of the People, and Ordination, or the laying on of the hands of the Bishops?

And in such a Sense must we take all the Expressions to be met with here and there in the Works of *Cyprian*, which seem to import, that the Bishops had absolute Power. For example, *Every Bishop has freedom to determine in Matters relating to his own Church, by vertue of his own absolute and independent Power*: This is *J. S.*'s Interpretation; *Cyprian's*

Tom. I. pag 229: Words are, *Quando habeat omnis Episcopus pro licentia libertatis & potestatis suæ Arbitrium proprium, tamque judicari ab alio non possit, quam nec ipse potest judicare, sed expectemus universi judicium Domini nostri Jesu Christi.* The meaning is, that every particular Church or Presbytery have full Power within their own Bounds, and are not accountable to others as their Superiours, they acting or regulating their Affairs orderly, according to the Word of God, Acts of Assemblies, or Canons of Councils, and have a Sovereign Power in ordering all Ecclesiastical Affairs, which particularly concern themselves. And, the Unity of the Catholick Church may be very well preserved, tho' every Bishop dispose of and order

order his own Actus or Business, being to give an account of his Administrations to the Lord. *Epist. 5. p. 110. Manente concordiae vinculo, & perseverantiae Catholicae Ecclesiae individuo Sacramento, actum suum disponit & dirigit unusquisque Episcopus, rationem propositi sui Domino redditurus.* Cyprian is here telling Antonianus, That in former times some Bishops or particular Churches, admitted Adulterers to a public Profession of Repentance in order to Absolution, and that others would not admit such persons, and yet there was no Rupture of Communion on that Account: And hence he concludes, *Manente concordiae vinculo, &c. itaque*, Peace and Unity may be preserved, tho there be some Difference in particular Churches with respect to some Affairs of Discipline, as the Re-baptization of Hereticks, or the like. And he speaks to the same purpose with respect to the Re-baptization of Hereticks, in an epistle to Stephanus Bishop of Rome, Every Bishop, says he, *has the free determination of his own will, in the administration of the Church. Qua in re nec nos vim aliquam facimus, aut Legem damus, cum habeat in Ecclesiae administratione voluntatis suae arbitrium liberum unusquisque Praepositus, rationem actus sui Domino redditurus,* The meaning is, that with respect to debatable Points, such as Re-baptization of Hereticks, (or things which for ought we know are not clearly determin'd in Scripture) every particular Church may follow such Methods, or carry so as they think they will be answerable to God. *Et sic de ceteris.* All these and the like Phrases in the Works of Cyprian or elsewhere, which the Prelatists build so much upon and make such a Noise about, were ordinary Style in those days, and well understood then, when People were not so disingenuous as now, nor so ready to quibble about the sound of Words, when their meaning was easily enough discoverable: And we may say, that the sound of such Sentences, and not the

the sense of them, makes for the Absolute Power of Bishops ; and that *J. S.* was more vain than he had reason, when upon review of these and the like Phrases, he said, These are very full Assertions of the Episcopal Power, so full, that I cannot think *G. R.* would ever have had the Courage to have question'd the Episcopal Sovereignty, if he had had the good Fortune to have consider'd them.

There are also other Sentences which *J. S.* sets down p. 340. of his Vindication, &c. as countenancing the Absolute Power of Bishops, but they have no tendency that way. For Example, *Cyprian* says, Ep. 59. p. 136. *Nam cum statutum sit omnibus nobis, & æquum sit pariter ac justum, ut uniuscujusque causa illi audiat ubi est crimen admissum, & singulis pastoribus portio gregis sit adscripta quam regat unusquisque & gubernet, rationem sui actus Domino redditurus.* But *Cyprian* says no more here of a Bishop, than *Thucydides* said of *Pericles*, viz. That when he was over the Common-wealth, or had the charge thereof, he Governed it with Moderation, and this is what may be said of any principal Magistrate in a Republican State. Wherefore the Bishop's Absolute Power cannot be inferr'd from such Sayings, nay not so much as the Negative Voice.

But one Instance more, and that out of *Cyprian* himself, and then we have done : It is this, *Cyprian* writing to *Cornelius* Bishop of *Rome*, says of the Presbyter *Novatus*, that he made *Felicissimus* Deacon at *Carthage*, and *Novatianus* Bishop at *Rome*, Ep. 52. p. 97. *Qui istie adversus Ecclesiam Diaconum fecerat, illum Episcopum fecit.* Pray good Mr. *J. S.* what way did *Novatus* a Presbyter make *Novatianus* Bishop? did he elect, ordain him by imposition of his own hand admit him into the Episcopal College, and all by his singular Authority, or Absolute and independent Power? What was the Matter then? Consult the Learned Bishop of *Chester*, *Annal. Cypr.* p. 25. (nay consult

your self Vindic. &c. p. 309.) *Novatus* made *Novatian* Bishop, says he, *that is*, He and the Faction at Rome procur'd him to be made Bishop †, prevail'd with three *Italian* Bishops to ordain *Novatian*. And by we, Bishop *Rogatianus* depos'd his Deacon, the same way, procur'd him to be depos'd by the Presbytery, and that he could depose him no other way is more than evident by what has been said, and particularly by the Canons of Councils we have cited.

This Instance alone may be sufficient to make these who are not wilful, or blinded by Prejudice, sensible of the feebleness and senselessness of the Arguments for the Monarchical Power of the Bishops taken from the Sayings or Expressions in the Works of *Cyrian*, or the like. I appeal to *J. S.*'s ingenuity here, if we may not with as good Reason say, That *Rogatianus* depos'd or might depose the Deacon by his Interest with the Presbytery, being Bishop and Moderator, as he can say, that the Presbyter *Novatus* ordain'd *Novatian* by his Interest with the Faction at Rome, and the influence that Faction had on the three *Italian* Bishops to cause them ordain him? I'm perswaded there is such brightness of Evidence here, as may be sufficient to convince him, if he has so much power over himself as to be able to lay aside Prejudice and Passion. But if he has determined to persist in the furious Resolutions it appears he had taken up, when he was writing his 9. chapter, and said, He hop'd with God's Grace, to live and die as far in his Principles from Presbytery as from Popery; (but I'm sure all honest Men will reckon there's a vast Difference between 'em, little regarding the Resolutions of these who are driven to

Certe Novatianum Episcopum fecit id est, sua factione, ut fertur procuravit; non autem minime ordinavit, quem a tribus Episcopis, ex Italia accitis ordinatum esse postea probabimus. Blondel was certainly in a very gross Mistake here, it is ridiculous to imagine, that the Presbyter Novatus did himself ordain Novatian Bishop. (Cervelinus in his Epistle to Episc. Bishop of Antioch Hist. Eccles. lib. 6. cap. 43.) gives us Account, how Novatianus was ordain'd by three Italian Bishops.

to Extremities by Passion or Prejudice, or are acted by Interest) *that is*, If he be resolved to shut his Eyes against the Light, and never to hearken to Reason, but to continue pertinacious and obstinate to the last breath, however clearly the weakness and rottenness of the Foundation he build his Faith and Principles upon, may be discovered to him, it will be lost Labour to offer Arguments in order to his Conviction. *Qui decipi vult decipiatur*, and there is no more to be said.

In a word, what we have been insisting on all this time may be reduced to these few Heads.

1. That the Bishop being the Supreme Officer Ecclesiastical, and he who did alwise preside at the Management of any Affairs the Church was concern'd in, is oft times consider'd and spoken of in *Cyprian*, or the Canons of Ancient Councils, as the *Church's Representative*, on which Account, Acts of Ecclesiastical Jurisdiction or Power, went ordinarily in his Name, or were attributed to him, and said to be done by him, tho they were not and could not be perform'd by his, but by the Church's Authority.

And that the Bishop did thus represent the Church or act in Affairs of Discipline as the People's Representative, was the Opinion of *Augustine*. ' Thus ' says he, which Church (*το πῦρ*, that is happy in ' Hope, but in this Life afflicted) *Peter* did represent ' as being Chief among the Apostles. If you consider *Peter* Personally, he was one Man by Nature ' by Grace a Christian, and an Apostle by abundance ' of Grace: But when Christ said to him, Unto ' thee will I give the Keys of the Kingdom of Heaven, ' and whatsoever thou shalt bind on Earth shall ' be bound in Heaven, and whatsoever thou shalt ' loose on Earth shall be loosed in Heaven; he represented the whole Church, which is shaken by ' the Storms of Temptations in this World--- The ' Church

Church therefore which is built upon Christ, received from him the Keys of the Kingdom of Heaven in the Person of *Peter*, that is, the Power of binding and loosing sins *. And again, If *Peter*, says he, had not represented the Church, Christ would never have said to him, Unto thee will I give the Keys of the Kingdom of Heaven, &c. According to *Augustine* then, when our Saviour said, Whatsoever thou (*Peter*) shalt bind on Earth shall be bound in Heaven, his meaning was, Whatsoever my Church (or any of my Churches) shall bind on Earth shall be bound in Heaven. *Peter* was the principal Officer or Minister in the Church Universal: And what *Peter* was in the Universal Church, that is every Bishop in his particular Church, to wit, the principal Minister and Representative hereof.

Excellently doth this agree with the Principles of *Cyprian*, according to whom the Ecclesiastical Majesty, or Supreme Power resideth in the Faithful People, *Plebs intus posita fidelis atque incorrupta Majestas*, with he, The Ecclesiastical *Actus* or Administration, is not the Bishop's according to him, but the Church's

I i

Actus,

* Hoc agit Ecclesia, spe beata, in hac vita ærumnosa: Cujus Ecclesiæ Petrus potestus propter Apostolatus sui primatum gerebat figurata generalitate personæ. Quod enim ad ipsum proprie pertinet, natura unus homo erat, gratia unus christianus, abundantiore gratia unus idemque primus Apostolus. Sed quando dictum est, Tibi dabo claves Regni Cælorum, & quodcumque ligaveris per Terram, erit ligatum & in Cælis, &c. Universam significabat Ecclesiam, quæ in hoc seculo universis tentationibus velut imbris, juminibus, tempestatibus quatitur. Ecclesia ergo quæ fundatur in Christo claves ab eo Regni Cælorum accepit in Petro i. e. Potestatem ligandi solvendi que peccata, &c. Tract. 4. Exp. in Evan. Joan. Origen is of the same Opinion in his Commentation on Matthew, Hom. 1. εἰ δὲ φήσαντες καὶ ἡμεῖς ὡς ὁ Πέτρος, Σὺ εἶ ὁ Χριστός, ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ Θεοῦ τοῦ ζῶντος, &c. ὡς αἱματός ἀποκαλύψαντων, ἀλλὰ φωτὸς ἡμῶν καὶ καρδία ἐλλάμψαντος ἀπὸ τοῦ ἐν οὐρανοῖς πατρὸς γινομένης πέτρης, καὶ ἡμῖν ἄν λέγοιτο ἀπὸ τοῦ λόγου, τὸ σὺ πέτρος καὶ τὰ ἐξῆς, &c. i. e. If we say as Peter did, Thou art Christ the Son of the living God, not as having this reveal'd to us by deih and blood, but by Light from the Heavenly Father, shining in upon our hearts. We are Peter, and Christ will say to us, Thou art Peter, and what follows.

Actus, Et omnis actus Ecclesiæ per eosdem Præpositos, i. e. Episcopos gubernetur. The Power of binding and loosing was according to him, given to the Church, and belongs thereto: The Church which is one says he, and which alone can give the Grace of Baptism, and pardon sin: *Et intus in Ecclesia, quæ una est, & cui soli gratiam Baptismi dare, & peccata solvere permissum est,* Ep. 73. p. 202. All the Power Ecclesiastical belongeth thereto: The Church is one, says he, which has and possesseth *all the Power of her Spouse and Lord*, in this Church we preside, and it is for the Unity and Honour thereof that we contend, *Hæc Ecclesia est una, quæ tenet & possidet omnem sponi sui & domini potestatem, in hac præsidemus, pro honore ejus atque unitate pugnamus, hujus & gratiam pariter & gloriam fidei virtute defendimus.* *ibid.* p. 203. In fine, according to *Cyprian*, the Authority Ecclesiastical is not the Bishop's but the Church's Authority: Thus he telleth us, that *Novatian* would have been at vendicating to himself the Authority of the Catholick Church, tho he himself did not belong to the Church: *Nam Novatianus, simiarum more, quicum homines non sint, homines tamen imitantur, vult Ecclesiæ Catholicæ Autoritatem sibi & veritatem vendicare, quando ipse in Ecclesia non sit.* Ep. 73. p. 198. Which is plainly to affirm, that the Ecclesiastical Authority that each Bishop is vested with, is the Authority of that particular Catholick Church over which he is set †.

Novatian then was in *Cyprian's* Opinion, destitute of the Episcopal Authority, not because he was unlawfully Ordain'd, for he was ordain'd by three Bishops, which was a sufficient Number for that end, in the Judgment of the Universal Church, and according to the Canons afterward, and particular

* *Qualibet Ecclesia (particularis) non hæretica aut Schismatica, Catholice dicitur,* says the Bishop of Oxford. i. e. Any particular Church, which is not Heretical or Schismatical, was call'd a Catholick Church.

of the Council of *Nice* ; but because the People over whom he was Bishop were out of the Church according to him, or were no Church at all, and consequently had no Ecclesiastical Authority, had not the Power of Keys, and therefore *Novatian* could have no Episcopal Authority, seeing the Episcopal Authority is the Church's Authority, depends upon the Authority of the Church, and is derived therefrom ; that People, not being a Church, had no Ecclesiastical Power themselves, and consequently could not communicate any to him whom they made their Bishop.

Our holy Martyr argued very justly from his Principles here, but did build upon a Mistake, he had formed to himself a false Idea of the Unity of the Church, thinking that the Church could not subsist in different Communions, and consequently that they who were separated from the External Communion thereof, were out of the Church, or were no Church at all. Whereas, tho a Body of People, impos'd upon by a cunning and self-seeking Man, as it is likely *Novatian* was, separate unjustly from the Church, yet if they continue in the Belief and Practice of the Fundamentals of Religion, they are still true Church, have true Bishops and Sacraments, and are by their Love and Faith still united to Jesus Christ, and consequently are in Union with the Church really, tho externally separated from it. Now this was the Case of the *Novatians*, they maintain'd no considerable Errors, adhered to the Fundamentals of Christianity, and therefore were a part of the Catholick Church, notwithstanding of their being separated from the External Communion of the other Churches ; and whatever the Opinion of *Cyprian* and *Cornelius*, or other Bishops in their day might be about them. I make this Observation out of a just Indignation, at the impious and monstrous Opinion of these among us, who are for shutting

up the Universal Church within one External Communion, and for Unchurching all these that are separated from it, and think it nothing to pronounce a Sentence of eternal Damnation on Millions of honest Men, and much better Christians, and sincerer Lovers of Christ and the Gospel than they are themselves, if that may contribute any way to the carrying on of their knavish and selfish Designs. External Communion among the Churches is not that which makes them Churches, but their believing the Fundamental Doctrines of Christianity, and their Love to God, and Faith in Jesus Christ: Wherefore a Body of People who do believe the Fundamental Doctrines, and walk suitably to the Gospel, are a true Church, tho separated externally from all the other Churches in the World, and it can no more be said that they are not a Church, because they are separated externally from the rest of the Churches, than it can be said, that the rest of the Churches are not Churches, because they are separated from it. Will any Man of sense say, that the seven Provinces are not a Nation or a Civil Society, and have not Magistrates, because forsooth they are broken off from the Monarchy of *Spain*?

And therefore, tho the Separation of the *English* Dissenters were unjust, sinful and unwarrantable, as it is not, yet seing they live in the Belief of the Fundamentals of Christianity, and seing Love to God, and Faith in Christ abounds among them, they are true Churches, have the Authority of the Catholick Church, to use *Cyprian's* Expression, true Bishops, Sacraments, &c. In a word, they who have Faith and Love have all things, let the Papists and others say what they will, *All things are yours whether Paul, or Apollos, or Cephas, and ye are Christ's and Christ is God's.* And none will pretend that such are out of the Church, excepting those who are for making

Tool of the Church and the Gospel, nay of Christ himself for their own ends.

In like manner, tho the Separation of the Prelatists in *Scotland* is most unjust and unwarrantable, yet, in so far as they adhere to the Fundamentals of Religion, entertain Love to God, and have Faith in Jesus Christ among them, they are true Churches, have true Sacraments, and true Bishops, Pastours I mean ; for I reckon not these Men Bishops, whom they ignorantly look on as such ; and if any Presbyterians say otherwise (but not one of them will say otherwise for ought I know) it must be imputed to Ignorance or Passion : Their Separation is sinful and schismatical indeed, but it is not every sin that will pinch Church People and separate them from Christ, if they have honest Intentions in what they do, God will bear with many Infirmities in these who are sincere and follow their Light, the Crime lieth principally at the door of these who are the Ring-leaders, and seduce the People to such Methods for their own ends, and they will be made to reckon for the Disturbances they have made in the Church. But return.

Cyprian and *Augustin* were the greatest and most approved Doctors of the Church in their time, and they delivered this Doctrine, you see, very plainly and positively, and they thought not, when they proposed it, that they advanced an Opinion contrary to Scripture or the Belief of the Universal Church ; and no Father of the Church, either in their time or before it, denied this Doctrine, or condemned it as unsound, or advanced things inconsistent with it, and no Fathers, either in their time or after it, ever quarrel them for it as Inventors of Novelty, or Propagators of Opinions contrary to the common Belief of the Church. Wherefore we may look on what they say with respect to this Particu-

lar, as the Relief of the Universal Church in their day.

And seeing the Bishop thus represented the Church, and the Power he exerted was the Church's Power, *Cyprian* might very properly attribute the Power of the Church to him, or say, that the Acts of Discipline or Jurisdiction were perform'd by him, which were indeed perform'd by the Authority of the Church. Thus, tho' he says expressly in *Epist.* 73. That it is the Church that bindeth and looseth, or forgiveth sins, he says *Epist.* 59. *I can pardon all Crimes, I dissemble many through the earnest desire I have of collecting the Fraternity, nay even those Crimes which are committed against God I do not examine with the rigidest Severity; I receive all sincere Penitents, all who do humbly confess their sins, &c.* There is no possibility of reconciling, or making good sense of these things, unless it be suppos'd that *Cyprian* speaks here as the Representative of the Church, or that he must be understood as if he had said, *Our Church can pardon all Crimes, we dissemble many through the earnest desire we have of collecting the Fraternity, we receive all sincere Penitents, &c.* Thus, tho he intended to say, *The Unity of the Catholick Church may be very well preserved, tho every particular Church be Master of their own Acts or Administrations*, he might and did very handsomely, and according to the Dialect of the times, express himself thus, *The Unity of the Catholick Church may be very well preserved, tho every Bishop be Master of his own Acts or Administrations, &c.*

2. Oft times Acts of Power or Jurisdiction, are attributed to a particular Person, or said to be done by him (tho they were not all done by his Authority) because they were done thro' his Influence, or by his perswasion, or because he had a principal hand in causing those things to be done by these in whom the Authority was lodged. Thus *Pericles* said to have banished *Thucydides*, because it was thro

his Influence that the People of *Athens* sent that Person into Banishment. Thus the Presbyter *Novatus* made *Novatianus* Bishop of *Rome*.

3. It was a familiar and customary way of speaking in ancient times, to say, that such an Act of Power was perform'd by a particular Person, tho that Act was not and could not be perform'd by him, but in conjunction with others acting in parity of Power with him. Thus *Thucydides* says, *Nicias* thought to divert the *Athenians* from the *Sicilian War*; by commanding great reparations to be made, tho he could not command any Preparations to be made but in conjunction with others. Thus *Dion* says, l. 37. ἐπεὶ δὲ ἑστὸς αὐτὸς τε τὸν ἀνατοῦ αὐτῶν κατεδίκασε. i. e. *Postquam Cato ipse morte eos condemnavit*, after *Cato* had condemned to death, viz. these who were guilty of the Conspiracy with *Catilin*, yet *Cato* could not condemn them to death but in conjunction with the Senate; *Cato's* condemning them to death, imports no more but his giving his Vote that they should be condemned. And *Cyprian* says in Ep. 67. *Maxime cum jam pridem bis cum, & cum omnibus omnino Episcopis in toto mun-* *constitutis, etiam Cornelius Collega noster sacerdos* *piscus ac justus, & Martyrio quoque dignatione Do-* *mini honoratus, decreverit ejusmodi homines ad pœni-* *entiam quidem agendam posse admitti.*

4. Sometimes things are said to be done by a Person or Persons, when the meaning is only, that it is the Opinion or Desire of that Person or Persons that the things be done by these who had the Authority or Power to do them. Thus the Confessors write to *Cyprian*, *Know that we have given Pæne to these Lapsers, &c. Scias nos, &c. that is*, it is our Opinion that these Lapsers be received, or we desire and petition, that they be received into the Face of the Church. Lapsers could not be received into Communion until they had gone thro' a long course of Penance, for some Months, nay Years,

according to the appointment of the Canons. Yet, to put Respect and Honour on the Martyrs or Confessours, the Church granted them this Privilege, That these of the Lapsers who could procure their Recommendation, or for whom they should petition, might be received into Communion immediately, without undergoing the ordinary course of Penance. This set the Lapsers a-work to address the Confessours. The Confessours began at length to abuse this Privilege, recommending unworthy Persons to be received, or petitioning for the Reception of many, in whom there were no Evidences at all of sincere Repentance to be seen. *Cyprian* perceiving this, out of Conscience and Sense of Duty, sets himself to oppose the Reception of many of the Lapsers recommended to the Peace of the Church by the Confessours. It is easy to see then, that when the Confessours say, *Know that we have given Peace to these Lapsers*, their meaning is, Know it is our Opinion that these Lapsers be received, or, Know that we recommend these Lapsers to you, or petition for them according to the Privilege granted to us by the Church. We may add in the

5. Place, That oft times general Expressions must be limited, or that which Authors express in general Terms, must be restricted to the *Materia Substrata*, or understood with particular reference to the Purpose in hand, or the thing or things mentioned in the Discourse. Every body knows how to understand what the Apostle's meaning was, when he said, *All things are lawful unto me, but all things are not expedient*, to wit, all things that are not prohibited by the Law of God, or all such things as is there speaking of, viz. all sorts of Meats or the like. And in this sense several Sentences to be met with in *Cyprian's* Epistles, must be understood. Take an example or two. In *Epist.* 69. pag. 18 he says, *Nemini præscribentes quo minus statuat qui*

ut unusquisque Præpositus, adus sui rationem Domino redditurus. The Matter is this. A certain Person Maximus consults him with respect to these who came over to the Church from the Sect of the Novatians, *scilicet*, Whether they should be rebaptiz'd. Cyprian answers, that for his own part, he look'd on the Novatians as Persons not within the Pale of the Church, and consequently believed, that they had not the right or Power of Baptism among them, and consequently that they who came over to the Church from that Sect should be baptiz'd, as not having received lawful and valid Baptism among the Novatians. When he adds, He does not at all pretend to dictate, that his Opinion should be a Law to others as to this Particular, *Nemini præscribentes quominus statuit, sed putat unusquisque Præpositus, id est*, Notwithstanding my Opinion, every Bishop may carry with respect to this Affair as he thinks fit, or so as he thinks he may be able to justify himself before God. Therefore *J. S.* prevaricates when he renders the words thus, *That every Bishop may make Statutes as he thinks fit within his own District*; as if Cyprian had intended to say, That every Bishop may make what laws he pleases for his own Diocese or Church, which may indeed be inferr'd from his own Exposition, but not from the words of Cyprian. Thus also in Epistle 73. p. 210. Cyprian says, *Nemini præscribentes et præjudicantes quominus unusquisque Episcoporum quod putat faciat, habens arbitrii sui liberam potestatem*, which *J. S.* renders thus, *That every Bishop has so much free Power of his own Arbitriment, that he may do in his own Diocese what seems good unto him.* The Case is the same with the preceeding. Cyprian says that every Bishop may do in his own Diocese what seems good unto him, this is *J. S.*'s false gloss, that that he might do what he thought fit with respect, *scilicet*, the Re-baptizing of these who should come over from the Novatian Sect, which was a

CASE the Church was divided about at that time and with respect to which, *Cyprian* was therefore of Opinion, that every Bishop or Church might be allowed to follow their own Light, or do in it as they thought fit, without being troubled for it, or quarrell'd by their Neighbours, whatever their Practice might be in the Affair, seing they knew not well how to make a Decision in this Controversy by the Word of God. If a Minister or Bishop at *Glasgow* should ask Advice of a Minister at *Edinburgh*, about the using of the Lord's Prayer as a Form, and if the Minister at *Edinburgh* should write to him thus, I'm indeed of Opinion that it should be us'd as a Form, and it is us'd so by us here, notwithstanding we pretend not to prescribe to others, seing every Minister has Liberty to do as he thinks fit, would it not be ridiculous to inferr hence, that the Minister at *Edinburgh* is of Opinion, or affirms, that every Minister has Absolute Power in his own Church?

Now seing there is nothing said of the Bishop in the Works of *Cyprian* or any other Author, or Canon of any Council, in the first Four Centuries, that looks any thing like his having *Absolute Power* or *Negative Voice* in the Church, but what may be commodiously reduced to one of these Heads, and explain'd thereby; we conclude, that we have no reason at all to believe, that the Bishop had any more Power in the Church during the time of these Centuries, than a Presbyterian Minister in *Scotland* has in his Paroch at this day.

After all, tho there were some Expressions in *Cyprian's* Epistles or elsewhere, which we could not put a convenient sense upon, and that should look like a Monarchical Power in the Bishop whether we would or not, (but our Prelatists have not been able to produce any such hitherto that I know of) we might say, and that with very good reason, in the words of the late Learn'd and Reverend Bishop

Stilling

Stillingsfleet, That every hyperbolical Expression of a Father will not bear the weight of an Argument. Certainly, to make an Argument of an Expression a Father drops be the by, when to inform us about the nature of the Episcopal Power is not the thing he has in view, is to build upon an uncertain Foundation. Sometimes Writers speak indistinctly of a thing which they are not intending to explain, but bring in accidentally only when they are handling another Subject. Thus *Herodian lib. 2. §. 38.* says Ἦς ὅσον μὲν γὰρ ὑπὸ Δημοκρατίας τὰ Ρωμαίων διοικεῖτο καὶ ἡ σύγκλητος ἐξεπεμπε τὸς τὰ πολεμικά στρατηγησοντας. *Etenim quamdiu libera civitas egit, atque a senatu Belli Duces eligebantur, uere in armis semper Italia Nationis, &c.* If any Person should make an Argument of this, and conclude, that all the Generals and Officers of the Army were chosen by the Senate in the times of the Republick, and not at all by the People of Rome, he would mistake his Measures.

C H A P. VI.

Other Arguments answered, by which they think to prove, That the Bishop had a Sovereign or Monarchical Power in Cyprian's time,

F. J. S. has any more to say on this head, it is scarce worth the noticing. He tells us (page 348) of a very remarkable Instance of the Episcopal Sovereignty, to wit, That even the major part of his Presbyters could do nothing against him, the Case was this, When he writ his 43 Epistle,

there were only eight Presbyters belonging to his Diocess, of these eight five united their Counsels against him, and three of them only stood with him. Had he then been no more than a simple Moderator, it is manifest he had been fairly and legally and irreprehensibly outvoted, for he and his three Presbyters made up in all but four, and there were five against them, yet all the World judged the five guilty, and approved *Cyprian* and the three, &c.

J. S. must give me leave to say, That this, to use his own phrase, is infinitely weak, tho' urged by Mr *Dodwel* himself, even as weak as any thing advanced by G. R. in any of his Writings. It is true, all the World justified *Cyprian* and the three Presbyters and condemned the five, but not because *Cyprian* had a Sovereignty (nothing appears that may be a shadow of a Pretence for this) but because he and the three Presbyters were in the right, and the Church of *Carthage* adher'd to them, and the five Presbyters together with the scandalous Crew that too part with them, acted impiously and notoriously against God and the Laws of the Gospel, and Practice of the Universal Church. If the three Presbyters alone had retain'd their Integrity, and *Cyprian* had join'd with the other five in their Villanies, it would evidently have been the Duty of all the Churches, and no doubt they would actually have justified the three honest Presbyters, and concurr'd with them; and the profligate Bishop together with the five had been depos'd and Excommunicated. If there were a Minister in a Paroch and eight Elders, and if five of these Elders should make Defection and become guilty of gross Enormities, and top with the Minister and the three Elders who retain their Integrity, and persist in their wickedness, and if the Affair come before a Synod, will not the Synod condemn the five apostate and impious Elders and depose them, and approve the Proceeding

ings of the Minister and the other three Elders? And may not this be without supposing that the Minister has a Sovereignty, or that five Elders cannot outvote a Minister and three Elders, when they are acting regularly? Indeed if *J. S.* had made it appear, that the five Presbyters were depos'd or excommunicated by *Cyprian* and the three, without the Authoritative concurrence of the People or any other, he had said something; but that is what he neither did nor could do. And *Cyprian* himself says, they were Excommunicated by the Synod, or at least by the Church of *Carthage* and Presbytery, having several Neighbouring Bishops joining with them †.

The Commentary which (in page 344) he puts upon this Sentence of *Cyprian*, *Seing when I first enter'd on my Episcopal Office I determin'd statuerim, to do nothing by my self without your Advice, and the Consent of my People*, appears to be jocular. When he enter'd to his Bishoprick, says *J. S.*, *Statuerat*, he resolv'd or determin'd to do nothing without the foresaid Advice and Consent: the very word, he says, manifestly implies, that there was no more in it than his own *Voluntary condescension*, it was a thing he was not bound to by any Divine Prescript, Apostolical Tradition, or Ecclesiastical Constitution, &c. Thus to determine with himself.

The truth is, he might as well have said, that it was of free Choice, and *Voluntary condescension* that *Paul* preached *Christ crucified* to the *Corinthians* and if he had pleas'd, he might as well have preached *Apheus* or *Zoroaster* to them. Why? Because he says, *I determin'd not to know any thing among you but Jesus Christ and him Crucified, ex qua, Fugite, statueram, I determin'd*, the very word he uses

Qui est unus ex quinque Presbyteris, jam pridem de Ecclesia profugis, Sententia Oepiscoporum nostrorum, & multorum gravissimorum virorum nuper absentis. Ep. 59. p. 131.

uses manifestly implies somuch. Is it not very likely think you, it was nothing but voluntary Condescension in *Cyprian* that he acted in conjunction with the Presbytery, when it was far otherwise with the Bishop 100 Years after that time, as is evident from this Canon we cited before, *Episcopus nullius causam audiat absque præsentia clericorum suorum, alioquin irrita erit sententia Episcopi nisi clericorum sententia confirmetur?* Wherefore *J. S.* may as well say, it is o voluntary Condescension that the King allows the Parliament to Vote in making Laws, &c.

The Presbyterians once thought it right sure that in *Cyprian's* time the Presbyters rul'd the Church in conjunction with the Bishop, and were Copartners with him in the Governing Power; for *Cyprian* in one Epistle to *Cornelius* Bishop of *Rome* says He hopes he did not neglect to read his Letters to the most flourishing Clergy which did preside ther together with himself, and to the most Holy and numerous People: *Tecum illic præsidenti.* And the truth is, this seem'd to be very probable, because at the Ruling Power the Bishop had or could pretend to in the Church us'd to be express'd by this word *Preside.* Thus *Euseb. Hist. Eccl. lib. 7. cap. 32.* says *Caius* (Bishop of *Rome*) presided there about 1 years: And according to the Stile of this Author such a Man *presided*, is as much as to say, such a Man was Bishop of such a place. Thus *lib. 7. ch. 14.* *Xistus* presided at *Rome*, i. e. was Bishop of *Rome.* And *l. 5. c. 22.* At *Cæsarea* in *Palestina* presided *Theophilus*, that is, was Bishop of *Cæsarea.* And again, at this time *Anicetus* presiding over the *Roman Church* &c.

But among the many ill turns *J. S.* has done to the Presbytery, this is one, that he has spoil'd this Demonstration to us. For, he gives us to understand that in stead of *Florentissimo Clero tecum illic Præsidenti*, some Copies of *Cyprian's* Works have only

Tecum illic Præsenti. Wherefore it is a Question, no doubt, whether the Presbyters had any hand at all in Ruling the Church in those days? 'Tis true, they were present with *Cornelius*; this will not be denied: but there is a vast difference between *being present with him*, and *managing the Government in conjunction with him*.

There are indeed some Copies of *Cyprian*, in which some Zealous Men for the good Cause, have put *præsenti*, in place of *præsidenti* in this Sentence, and made several other Amendments, but this they did by way of perfidiousness and treachery; and if the New-Testament had been in as few hands, as the Works of *Cyprian* and such Authors were, doubtless it would have been corrected to us finely in several places after the same manner; and the word *especially* had been blotted out in the 17th Verse of the 5th Chapter of *Paul's* Epistle to *Timothy*, as a very incommodious thing; or we should have had the Sentence handsomely inverted after such a manner as this, Let the Elders that labour in the Word and Doctrine, be counted worthy of double honour, but especially they who Rule well. And several other Amendments of this kind had certainly been made. Hear what the Eminent and Famous Mr. *Dallie* (whom the Author of the *Just Prejudices against the Calvinists* calls the greatest and the most learn'd Man that ever was among the Protestants) says with respect to this Particular.

'Laying Reason and Honesty aside, *says he*, they (to wit *J. S.'s* dear Friends, who put *Præsenti* in lieu of *Præsidenti*) have most miserably and shamelessly corrupted all sorts of Books and Authors: Certainly we cannot speak of the baseness of these Men, who go so desperately to work, after that manner it deserveth: and in my Judgment *Laurentius Bockellus*, in his Preface to the *Decreta Ecclesiæ Gallicanæ*, had all the Reason in the World
to

to detest these Persons as a People of a most wretched and malicious Spirit, who have most miserably gelded and mangled so vast a Number of Authors, both Sacred and Profane, Ancient and Modern: their ordinary Custom being to spare no Person, nor Kings, no not St. Lewis himself, out of whose Pragmatica Sanctio they have blotted several Articles, principally these which concern'd the State of France, in the Bibliotheca Patrum, Constitutiones Regiæ, and the Synodical Decrees of certain Bishops lately printed at Paris. VVo, VVo, to speak with the Prophet to these mischievous Knaves, who do not only lay such treacherous Snares for the venerable Chastity and Integrity of the Muses, but do also most impudently and wickedly deflour, under a false and counterfeit Pretence of Religion, even the Muses themselves, accounting this Juggling to be a kind of pious Fraud. But we do not here write against those Men, it is sufficient for us to give a hint only of that which is as clear as the Sun, namely, that these Men have altered and corrupted by their Additions in some places and Gelding of others, very many of the Evidence of the Belief of the Ancients. These are they who in this period of the 12 Epistle of Cyprian writ to the People of Carthage, (viz. I desire that they would patiently bear our Counsel,--- that our Fellow Bishops being assembl'd together with us, we might together examine the Letters and Desires of the blessed Martyrs, according to the Doctrine of our Lord, in the presence of the Confessors, and according as ye shall think convenient, secundum vestram quoque Sententiam) have maliciously left out these words And according as you shall think convenient, by which we may plainly understand, that these Men would not have us by any means to know, That the Faithful People had ever any thing to do with or had any Vote in the Affairs of the Church. These be they who in Ep. 40. have chang'd Peter

into *Petrum*, Rock into *Peter*, putting *Cathedra una super Petrum Domini voce fundata*, in lieu of, *Super Petram Domini voce fundata*, &c. Thus Mr. Dallie.

Wherefore the Bishop of *Oxford* acted unadvisedly; when he set down *Tecum illic presenti*, in the foot of the page amongst the various Readings, he should not have so far countenanced such a perfidious Trick; but pass'd it by as not worth the noticing: he has discovered a partial Affection to Tyrannical Pre-acy hereby, but done it no other service. How ready are they, who are for engaging others in their *per fas & nefas*, to take Advantage of the like of this?

Then *J. S.* tells us, (p. 341, 342.) That *Cyprian*, during the time of his Retirement, gave Laws to his Presbyters and Deacons sometimes in Matters of lesser Consequence, and sometimes of greater. e. g. While thus in his Retirement, he sends them particular Orders concerning the Poor, visiting the Confessors in Prison, recording particularly the days on which any Martyrs or Confessors died in Prison, that afterwards due Regards might be paid to their memories. He constitutes them his Vicars, and commands them to do both his Work and their own. He orders them to Communicate such and such of his Epistles to the People; and of others of them, to give Copies to such stranger Bishops, or Clergy-Men, as at any time should happen to be in the City; all these things he enjoins Authoritatively, and in the Style of a Superior. But least these should be deem'd Matters of lesser Consequence, add, That even in Matters which were then reputed of very great importance, he exercised this Legislative Power. His Presbyters and Deacons writ to him for a *Form*, he peremptorily forbade them to reconcile any Lapsed otherwise than he had ordered; and he not only condemn'd it as an un-

accountable and unexampl'd Presumption, if they should offer to reconcile those Lapsers otherwise than he had prescrib'd ; But he added a very severe Sanction to his Law ; he threatens them with a Suspension from the Exercise of their Office, nay even with Excommunication it self, if they should transgress.

For my part, I know not what should be said to such Banter. Is not this to treat his Readers as Idiots and Dunces ? Is not this to speak to the People of *Scotland* as if they were a Company of Ignoramus's or Blockheads ? For his Design is, no doubt, to make them sensible of their Error in abolishing Prelacy, and setting up Presbyterian Government in this Church, and that the People of *England* have behaved much more wisely and honestly, and more agreeably to the Principles of Christians in the *Cyprianick* Age, by adhering to that Government.

Verily he might as well have said, That Bishop *Ignatius* was Bishop *Polycarp's* Sovereign Lord, had Absolute Power over him, and gave Laws to him because he writ to him, and exhorted him after this manner.

' Maintain thy place with all care both of Flesh
' and Spirit, make it thy Endeavour to preserve U
' nity in thy Church, than which nothing is better
' Bear with all Men, even as the Lord with thee
' support all in Love, as also thou doest ; pray with
' out ceasing, ask more Understanding than what
' thou already hast, be watchful having thy Spirit
' alwise awake, speak to every one according as God
' shall enable thee, bear the Infirmities of all as
' perfect Combatant, where the Labour is great
' the Gain is so too. Every Wound is not heal'd
' with the same Plaster, if the Accessions of the Dis
' ease be vehement, mollify them with soft Remedies
' Let not the Widows be neglected, be thou as for
' God, their Guardian. Let your Assemblies be

more frequent, enquire into all by Name, overlook not the Men and Maid-servants, neither let them be puffed up, but rather let them be more subject to the Glory of God. Flee evil Arts, or rather make not any mention of them. Say to my Sisters, that they love the Lord, and be satisfied with their own Husbands both in the Flesh and Spirit. In like manner, exhort my Brethren in the Name of Jesus Christ, that they love their Wives even as the Lord the Church. But for as much as I have not been able to write to all the Churches, because I must suddenly sail from *Troas* to *Neapolis*, do you write to the Churches that are near you, that they also may do in like manner; let those that are able send Messengers, and let the rest send their Letters by those who shall be sent by you.

Cyprian wrote to the Presbytery and Church of *Carthage* never a whit more Authoritatively, or in the Stile of a Superior, than *Ignatius* doth here to *Polycarp*, and did no more send Orders concerning the Poor, and visiting the Confessors in Prison, &c. than *Ignatius* did concerning the Widows, and the Men or Maid Servants; and did no more exert a Legislative Power, than *Ignatius* when he writ, *Let our Assemblies be more frequent, &c.* And if *Ignatius* had pleas'd, he could have added a severer Sanction to his Laws, and told *Polycarp*, That he should be damn'd eternally if he did not give punctual Obedience. But it is not worth the while to insist on such Trifles.

That we may not omit any thing that has appearance of Difficulty, *Cyprian* (and some Bishops that were with him at the time) did indeed, when he was in his Retirement, and so without the Presbytery, ordain *Numidicus* Presbyter, and *Aurelius, Celerinus* and *Saturus* Lectors. But this helps not the Prelatical Cause, and proves not, that the Bishop had a Sovereignty. For, as to the Ordination of *Numidi-*

cus and *Aurelius*, he did plead immediate Revelation, and no Presbytery or Church will quarrel a Minister or Bishop for ordaining an Elder or a Deacon without them, if he can instruct an immediate Command from God for his Warrant. And as to the Ordination of *Celerinus*, he also pretended Revelation: And lest this should not prove altogether satisfactory to the Presbytery and People, he makes a Reference of the Affair to them, (*lectis literis nostris quibus ego & Collegæ referimus ad vos, viz. ad Presbyterium & Ecclesiam*, Ep. 39.) *quo sensu referre ad Senatum dicitur*, says the Learn'd Bishop of Oxford, *Nimirum ut quod factum erat illorum suffragio ratum haberetur, that is*, That the *Carthaginian* Church and Presbytery might either ratify that Ordination, or if they misbelieved him, cass and disannull it as the *Roman* Senate might do, when a Reference of any Case was made to them. *Lastly*, As to the Ordination of *Saturus*, he makes a very good Excuse. *Nihil ergo a me*, says he, *absentibus vobis factum est sed quod jam pridem communi Consilio omnium nostrum cæperat, necessitate urgente promotum est*, Ep. 29. as much as to say, It could not properly be said, that he had ordain'd *Saturus* without their Concurrence or in their absence, seing he had only perfected that which before was concluded upon by them, being press'd thereto by urgent Necessity. And if it be thought, that the Necessity he pleads was not a sufficient Excuse, it may very well be said, That *Cyprian* made a wrong Step with respect to this Affair, he was not infallible, and might prevaricate sometimes: The Prelatists themselves will affirm, that his being for Re-baptizing these who came over to the Church from the *Novatian* Sect, was very unaccountable; and if the Disciples of Mr. *Dodwell* will not condemn *Cyprian's* Conduct with respect to the *Novatian's* (and indeed they must not if they be consequential to their Principles) they must condemn

lemon *Stephanus* Bishop of *Rome*, and the Church Universal soon after his time, and the Oecumenical Council of *Nice*. And I think we have more reason to say, That *Cyprian* made a wrong Step, than the *Dodwellians* have, That the Bishop of *Rome* and Council of *Nice* made a wrong Step.

C H A P. VII.

That which is now call'd Presbyterian Government in Scotland, is really Episcopal Government, in the same sense the Government of the Church was Episcopal in the 3. and 4. Centuries.

They tell us, That a Bishop in *Cyprian's* time was something more than a Presbyterian Moderator; and if by Presbyterian Moderator, you understand the Moderator of a Court we call the Presbytery, and Synod, or the like, the *Cyprianick* Bishop was indeed something more. Particularly, he had, as was said, this remarkable *Privilege*, That the Presbytery could do nothing of consequence without him: *that is*, If the Bishop was absent, the Presbytery was to do nothing of considerable Import without consulting or advising with him; and if the Episcopal Chair was vacant, the Presbytery us'd, and may be was obliged, to delay Affairs of greater Moment, till a new Bishop was constituted. Hence so many Letters concerning the Affairs of the Church of *Carthage* to and again between the Presbytery and *Cyprian*, when he was

in his Retirement. And hence the Presbytery of Rome writ to *Cyprian* as in the Margin *.

This was certainly an Innovation; there is neither *vola* nor *vestigium* in Scripture, of such a Privilege or Prerogative belonging to any one Person in the Church, whether Presbyter or Bishop, but very Ancient, had footing in the Church before *Cyprian's* time; and even in the days of *Ignatius*, there are some things in the Epistles of that Author which seem to look that way. And if I mistake not, this was one of the first Alterations that was made in the Government of the Church after the Departure of the Apostles, and one of the most early Steps towards that enormous Prelacy which was afterward set up.

But to tell us, That the *Cyprianick* Bishop was something more than the Moderator of a Presbyterian Synod or Presbytery, is to tell us that which is not to the purpose; for the Moderators of our Presbyteries or Synods, do not answer to the Bishop in *Cyprian's* time, but are the same with those who were call'd Metropolitans in the Ancient Church. The Moderators of the Synods and Courts we call Presbyteries, are Moderators among their Colleagues, or among these who are of the same Order and Degree with themselves, like the ancient Metropolitans; whereas the *Cyprianick* Bishop did act as Moderator among the Presbyters who were not his Colleagues, but were of an Order inferior to him, and exactly so these whom we call the Ministers Pastours, act as Moderator in the Kirk-Sessions Parochial Presbyteries, among the Presbyters, Elders and Deacons who are not their Colleagues.

* Quamquam nobis differendæ hujus rei necessitas major incumbat, cibus post excessum nobilissimæ memoriæ viri Fabiani, nondum est Episcopus propter rerum & temporum difficultates constitutus, qui omnia ista moderetur, & eorum qui lapsi sunt possit cum Autoritate & Consilio habere rationem. Ep. 30. p. 58. Ante Constitutionem Episcopi nihil innovare putavimus, sed Lapsorum curam mediocriter temperandam esse credimus. *Ibid.*

are inferior to them in Order. Wherefore our Pastor, or the Moderator of the Parochial Presbytery is the very same thing that the *Cyprianick* Bishop was.

And whatever Power the *Cyprianick* Bishop had in the Presbytery, the same has the Minister or Pastour now in the Session or Parochial Presbytery. Not long since, a Provincial Synod in this Nation made such an Act as this, That the Session or Parochial Presbytery, shall do nothing in Ecclesiastical Affairs without the Minister, That it is not a Legal-ty, or if you please, a Canonically constituted Court without him; so that whatever they act by themselves, *that is*, without their Minister presiding among 'em, or failing him, the Minister of some neighbouring Congregation, is *ipso facto* null and void, tho still he has no Negative Voice when he is there. The Power of the Presbytery was not so much minced in *Cyprian's* time.

Wherefore, notwithstanding all the Complaints against us for abolishing Episcopacy, (the Ancient and Apostolical Government of the Church) we have still such a Prelacy amongst us at this day, as was in the Church in the days of *Cyprian*. If the Ministers of that Synod we were speaking of (and the Ministers of the other Synods also follow the same way) were call'd *Bishops*, and their Ruling-aiders, *Presbyters*, and if the Acts of the Session or Parochial Presbytery, were made to go in the Name of the Minister or Bishop, or were call'd the Bishop's Acts, and if they should determine nothing of moment but in the presence of the whole Brotherhood, *Intermitate omni prasente*, (*that is*, All these of the Congregation whom they admit to Burgeesses of the Church) & *secundum eorum Arbitrium*, as *Cyprian* expresseth it; and if some of the Elders or Presbyters who are best qualified, were allow'd to Preach or Baptize in the absence of the Bishop or Minister,

I would defy *J. S.* and all his Fraternity to shew me one hair's-breadth of difference between the said Ministers, and the Bishops belonging to the Provincial Synods of *Carthage* and *Rome* in the days of *Cyprian* and *Cornelius*.

So that we may say, There is no difference but with respect to the Name, between the Ministers of our Congregations in *Scotland* at this day, and the Bishops who rul'd the Churches in *Cyprian's* day and a hundred Years after, and that the whole Scheme of our Government is the same with very little Variation. To come to Particulars,

1. The *Cyprianick* Bishop was a Congregational Bishop, his whole Diocess consisted of one single Congregation. In like manner, the Presbyterian Minister is a Parochial Bishop, one Congregation is his Diocess. But the *English* Prelate is a Bishop of many hundred Congregations, and therefore essentially different from the *Cyprianick* Bishops.

2. The *Cyprianick* Bishop was chosen by the People, and ordain'd not by the Presbytery but by the Neighbouring Bishops. The Presbyterian Bishop is also elected by the People, the Heritors and Elders propose, or nominate the Person to the People and if they be not satisfied may reject him: And not ordain'd by the Session or Parochial Presbytery but by the Neighbouring Bishops, or the Pastour of the Neighbouring Congregations. But the *English* Prelate is elected by the King.

3. Every Bishop in *Cyprian's* time had a Presbytery, a Court made up of Presbyters and Deacons and all the Presbyters and Deacons in this Presbytery belong'd to one Church or Congregation, the Congregation whereof the Bishop was Pastour. In like manner, every Presbyterian Bishop has a Presbytery, which is call'd the Session, and the Presbytery consists of the Elders and Deacons of the Congregation of which he is Pastour. But the

English Prelate has no Presbytery at all, and the *Scottish* Prelate had many Presbyteries, every one of which had a particular Moderator of its own. Wherefore the *Scottish* Prelate was a kind of a Bishop never heard of in the World before, and would certainly have been look'd on as a Monster in the days of *Cyprian*. And a Bishop without a Presbytery would have been thought no less strange, excepting perhaps if the Diocess or Congregation was so small, that it did not need any other Officer, but a Bishop and Deacon or two.

Perhaps they will say, that the *English* Prelate has his Presbytery, and will tell us of the Chapter. But this is to mock People. The Chapter has no affinity with an ancient Presbytery. 1. The ancient Presbytery consisted of all the Presbyters in the Episcopal Diocess, but the Chapter is not the twentieth part of these who are reckon'd the Presbyters of the Diocess. 2. The ancient Presbytery was chosen by the Church, but the Chapter is elected by the Bishop. What sort of a Parliament would it be, if the Members thereof were nominated by the King? it would be as good as none at all. 3. The ancient Presbytery managed the Discipline or Diocess of the Church, call'd the Scandalous in the Diocess before them, inflicted Censures, absolved Penitents, &c. but the Chapter does not meddle with the Discipline, with inflicting Censures on the Scandalous, or absolving Penitents, &c. Wherefore the Chapter can no more be call'd the Presbytery, than it can be call'd the Court of Admiralty or the like.

4. This *Cyprianick* Bishop and Presbytery ruled the Church, or managed the Discipline of the Congregation or Diocess, censured the Scandalous, &c. And the Presbyterian Bishop and Session, or Presbytery, do the same.

5. The *Cyprianick* Bishop was constant Moderator in the Presbytery. So is the Presbyterian Bishop.

6. The *Cyprianick* Bishop was so far from having Absolute Power, that he had not a Negative Voice. Neither has the Presbyterian Bishop.

7. All the Presbyters and Deacons of the Episcopal Diocess in *Cyprian's* time, were Members of the Presbytery, and did sit in it. So are all the Presbyters and Deacons in the Presbyterian Diocess at this day.

8. There were not many Presbyters in an Episcopal Diocess in *Cyprian's* time, there were never above eight in *Cyprian's* Diocess, tho it was one of the largest in the World at that time. And there are generally about eight, or ten, or twelve in a Presbyterian Diocess.

9. The *Cyprianick* Bishop acted as a daily and constant Pastour. So do the Presbyterian Bishops.

10. The *Cyprianick* Bishop preached and administered the Sacraments, and personally performed the Duties of a daily Pastour to all the People within his Diocess. So does the Presbyterian bishop. The *English* Prelate cannot do so, neither could the *Scottish* Prelates, they were Bishops then specifically different from the *Cyprianick* Bishop.

11. The *Cyprianick* Bishop took personal Inspection and Care of all the individual Persons in his Diocess. Thus *Pautinus*, see p. 15. Thus *Cyprian*, *Ipse singulos aggredi*, see p. 42. Thus *Ignatius*, *Enquire into all by Name*, see p. 12, 13. And this the Presbyterian bishop doth. The *English* Prelate cannot do so, and therefore is not a *Cyprianick* Bishop.

12. Seing the *Cyprianick* Bishop and his Presbyters had but one Congregation in charge among them all, and the Bishop himself acted as daily and constant Pastour, the Presbyters could have little or nothing to do, but to take notice of the Conversation of the

People, and to Rule. And thus our Presbyterian Bishop's Presbyters are *Ruling-Elders*.

If the Presbyterians contradict the Practice of the ancient Church, in not allowing the Presbyters or Ruling Elders to preach and administer Sacraments occasionally, or in the Bishop's absence; the Prelatists contradict it every whit, as much by allowing these whom they reckon Presbyters, to preach and administer Sacraments in the presence of their Bishops. The last Canon of the 1. Council of *Orange* appoints, *That if a Bishop lose his Senses or Tongue, it shall not be lawful for his Presbyters to perform the Episcopal Functions in his presence, but he shall send for a Bishop, who shall perform the Episcopal Functions in his Church.*

13. The *Cyprianick* Presbytery did nothing without the knowledge of the Bishop. *Let nothing be done without thy knowledge,* says *Ignatius* to *Polycarp*. And the Parochial Presbytery is not a legally constituted Court without the Minister or Pastour.

14. The *Cyprianick* Presbytery, if the Chair was vacant, used to delay Affairs of greater moment till Bishop was constituted. So doth the Parochial presbytery.

15. Ordination was reserved to the Bishop in *Cyprian's* time, to maintain (as says *Isodore*) the Authority and Splendour of the Priesthood. In like manner, the Presbyters belonging to our Presbyterian Bishops are not permitted to lay on hands, or be excluded from Ordinations; and for ought I know, the Splendour of the Priesthood is all the reason we can give for such a Practice, and our not ordaining the Deacons by imposition of hands contrary to clear Scripture Example, *Acts*, ch. 6.

16. All the Bishops in *Cyprian's* time were equal: *Neque enim quisquam nostrum Episcopum se Episcoporum constituit,* says *Cyprian*. i. e. None among us pretends to be a Bishop of Bishops. And thus all the Presbyterian Bishops are compleatly equal.

Thus now it is evident, that the *Presbyterian* Ministers are real proper *Diocesan Bishops*, *Diocesan Bishops* I say in that sense the *Cyprianick Bishops* were. And that there is no difference between a *Cyprianick* and *Presbyterian Bishop*, save that the one was ordinarily call'd a *Bishop*, and the other is ordinarily call'd a *Minister*, that is to say, the difference between them is not real but nominal only. In like manner, that which is now call'd *Presbyterian Government* in *Scotland*, is really *Episcopal Government*, in that sense the *Government of the Church* was *Episcopal* in the 3. and 4. *Century*. This will be evident abundantly if *Particulars* be considered.

1. In the 3. and 4. *Centuries*, every particular *Church*, *Diocess* or *Congregation*, was govern'd by its own *Bishop* and *Presbytery*. In like manner every *Presbyterian Church* or *Congregation* has its *Pastour* or *Bishop*, and *Presbytery* or *Session* by which it is governed.

2. For ought I know, the *Ancient Church* had no such stated *Ecclesiastical Courts* or *Judicatories*, as these which go under the Name of *Presbyteries* in *Scotland* at this day. The *Affairs of the Church* then were order'd by the *Pastours* or *Bishops*, and their respective *Congregational Presbyteries*, or what we call *Kirk-sessions*. And therefore, care should be taken, that *Presbyteries* be not permitted to inroach on the *Liberties of the Kirk-sessions*. Particularly, it would in my *Opinion* be more agreeable to *Divine Institution*, and the *Practice of the ancient Church*, that the *Ministers and Kirk-sessior* have the *Power of Excommunication*, (and it would not be amiss, that some *Neighbouring Bishops* or *Ministers* join them, or assist the *Minister and Session* in case of such weighty *Business*, according to the *Custom of the 3. and 4. Centuries*) than that they should be depriv'd thereof altogether. But considering that our *Presbyters* or *Elders* are no
wholl

wholly set apart to the Church's Service as they were in ancient times, and are Trades-men for the most part, and that the People now do not meddle in the Government as they did in the 3d. Century: I'm inclin'd to believe, that the Practice of the Church of *Scotland* as to this Particular, cannot be so much blam'd as otherwise it might. Yet the ancient Church had occasional Meetings, not unlike these Courts we now call Presbyteries: As when 6 or 12 Neighbouring Bishops join'd the Presbytery (or what we call the Session) in case of extraordinary Affairs, as we have said, as, when a Bishop or Presbyter was to be judged, or the like. *Sed & Iovinus & Maximus Sententia novem Episcoporum condemnati*, that was the Presbytery. *& iterata quoque pluribus nobis in concilio anno superiore abstenti*, that was the Synod. *Cypr. Ep. 59.*

3. They had their *Provincial Synods* like ours, which us'd to meet punctually, as ours do, twice a year, at least from the times of the Council of *Nice*, as appears from the 5. Canon; but with this Difference, That their Synods had constant Moderators in the 4. Century (and perhaps in the 3d.) who were call'd Metropolitans after *Cyprian's* time, and before the *Nicene* Council. But I cannot but say, that our Method in choosing Annual Metropolitans or Moderators, is much more equitable. Very reasonable it is, that the Bishop be perpetual Moderator in the Presbytery, seeing these who are the Constituent Members of the Presbytery, are inferior to him in Order or Degree. The Case is not the same with respect to the Synod, seeing they who are the Constituent Members thereof (I mean the Bishops or Pastours) are equal in Degree and Order. To refer one to all the rest because his Church is in the principal City is a ridiculous thing, and has no relation at all to the Nature of Churches, which are equal all of them whether they be in the City or

or Country. Seing all Bishops are equal, whether at Rome, or Eugubium, or Rhegium: it is just, that all of them be honoured equally, or be made Metropolitans tour about. *Ἴσος δὲνατον τὰς αὐτὰς μὴ τῶ αὐτῶν ἀξίως;* Quo pacto justum fuerit eosdem vel quos eodem jure prædinos esse oportet, non iisdem honoribus nec eodem jure dignos censeri? Thucyd. lib. 6. Then Encroachments are prevented hereby, and the Custom of having contrant Metropolitans, has produced mischievous Effects, as Experience witnesseth.

4. They had such *General Assemblies* as ours are *that is*, Courts to which all the Bishops did not come but these only who were *Deputed*, and sent from the particular Provinces to act in Name of the rest, and this Court did meet once a Year as our General Assemblies do. Thus one of the Councils of *Africa* in the 4. Century made this Canon, *to wit*, *That every Year a Council shall meet, to which every one of the Provinces of Africa shall send three Deputies, excepting the Province of Tripolis which can send but one, because of the paucity of Bishops in that Province.* And it appears by other Canons, that the Provinces might send a greater Number of Deputies to these general Synods if they thought fit. And thus our *General Assemblies* are made up of *Deputies* sent once a Year from the several Provinces, Shires, or Counties in the Nation, more or fewer, according to the greater or smaller Number of Ministers or Bishops in these Counties or Provinces. And if no Presbyters but only Bishops were sent to these General Synods, to which all the Bishops did not come but these only who were *Deputed*, yet it is certain, that these deputed Bishops were sent by the Bishops and Presbyters of the particular Provinces, and consequently acted in their Name, and by vertue of their Authority. And if Bishops or Pastours only should sit in our General Assembly, it would be the same Court

on the Matter as it is now, seing they would still act as now, not in their own Name, but by vertue of Commission or Deputation from the rest of the Ministers and Elders. But it cannot be denied that our way is much more equitable, in sending Presbyters or Elders, as well as Bishops or Pastours, to the General Council or Assembly, seing by Divine Appointment, and according to the Practice of the Universal Church for many Ages, they are sharers with the Pastours or Bishops in the Governing Power, and represent the Churches as well as they. Moreover, when the Bishops were intrusted to sit in Councils alone, they betrayed the Church, disposed all things to their own Interest, and made way to the setting up an Universal Monarch at length, and therefore they should never be trusted again, but should alwise have a convenient Number of Presbyters or Elders to act in conjunction with them in every Judicatory, which may be done very well, whatever the Practice of the Church was as to this Particular in the 4. or 5. Century, seing there is no Divine Appointment, or Apostolical Rule about Synods or General Assemblies, and Councils, whether Bishop or Pastours alone should sit in them, or Pastours and Presbyters or Elders, or how they should be proportion'd, whether there should be more Bishops than Presbyters in these Courts, or an equal Number of both, or the like, these things being left to Human prudence, and the Discretion of the Churches themselves. Wherefore, tho we should grant to J. S. that he has proven that Presbyters had not definitive Voices in Provincial Councils in *Cyprian's* time, when he calls up his Accompts we will find, that the gain is just nothing at all. However, notwithstanding all the ridiculous Pretences of Antiquity, the Prelatical *Scottish* Church never had, nor can the Church of *England* have, unless she alter her present Constitution, such an Ecclesi-

astri-

astical Court *General Assembly*, or Council; consisting of Bishops *deputed* by other Bishops, sitting in inferior Courts, Classes or Synods. All the *Englis* Bishops sit in the Convocation, there are no Bishop there *deputed* by other Bishops sitting in Court or Synods, inferior to the Convocation or General Synod.

5. They had their *Commission of the General Assembly*. For what else were they who were nominated to sit after the dissolution of the Assembly, to put an end to the Affairs which they had not time to finish. Thus an *African* General Assembly met at Carthage about the beginning of the 5. Century, and after much time was spent, some of the Bishops began to complain, That they were kept there too long, and desir'd to be permitted to return to their Diocesses whereupon *Deputies of each Province were nominated* by the Assembly to compleat what yet remain'd to be done. In like manner, so many are nam'd out of each Synod or Province, who remain after the Assembly is up, to compleat the Affairs it leaves unfinished, and they are that Court which we call, *The Commission of the General Assembly*. The 2. Council of Milevis followed the same Method; for it is said in the 27. Capitul. of that Council, *Item placuit ne diutius Universi Episcopi, qui ad Concilium congregati sunt, tenerentur, ab universo Concilio ternos judices singulis Provinciis eligi*. This was manifestly the thing that we call the Commission of the General Assembly. it was chosen the same way that our Commission is, and for the same end. And Augustinus was a Member of this Commission, as the Record of that General Assembly do witness, *Et electi sunt de Provincia Carthaginensi, Vincentius, Fortunatianus & Clarius; de Provincia Numidia, Alypius, Augustinus & Restitutus: De Provincia Byzacena, cum sancto senior Donatiano primate, Cresconius, Jocundus, & Emilianus: De Mauritania Sitifensi, Severianus, Asiaticus*

5. *Donatus, de Provincia Tripolitana, Plautius: qui omnes cum sancto sene Aurelio, universa cognoscant.* This now was the Commission of the General Assembly of Milevis. This Canon is the 127 in the *Codex Can: Ecclesi: Afric.*

6. The Moderator of our General Assembly, uses to be Moderator also to the Commission. So was it then. Thus another African General Assembly, That they might not detain the Bishops too long out of their Diocesses, chose three out of every Province, and gave them Power to order all things with Aurelius. This Aurelius was Bishop of Carthage, and Moderator of the General Assembly, and of the Commission also, as this Canon and that of the Council of Milevis manifest.

7. The Emperor Theodosius sent Candidianus a Count to the first Council of Ephesus to represent his Person in that Assembly, and to assist there in his stead; and this Nobleman produced a subscribed Commission from his Imperial Majesty, empowering him to maintain the Order and Freedom of the Council, to hinder Heats and Contests among the Members, &c. Thus the King's Commissioner sitteth in our General Assembly.

8. The King's Commissioner has no decisive Voice in our General Assembly, and neither had the Emperor's Commissioner the privilege of one in the Council. Thus the Emperor in his Epistle to the Synod of Ephesus, says, *Deputatus est Candidianus magnificus Comes strenuorum Domesticorum, transire usque ad Sanctissimam vestram Synodum; sed ea lege & conditione, ut cum quæstionibus & controversiis quæ circa fidei dogmata incidunt, nihil quidquam commune habeat; nefas est enim, qui sanctissimorum Episcoporum catalogo ascriptus non est, illum Ecclesiasticis negotiis & consultationibus sese immiscere.* ἀθεμιτον γὰρ τὸν ἔξω τῆ καταλόγου τῶν ἁγίων τῶν ἐπισκόπων τυγχάνοντα τοῖς ἐκκλησιαστικοῖς σκεύμασιν ἐπιμίγνυσθαι.

9. Our General Assembly uses to appoint some to prepare Business for them, which they call *The Committee of Overtures and Bills*. And the Ancient General Assemblies in *Africa* had some thing equivalent. Thus in the 6. Can. Counc. Carth. Anno 407, Judges are nominated to examine the Business of some Deputies who came not to the Assembly. And I warrant, if the Assembly was throng'd with multitude of Affairs, these Judges might e'en prepare Overtures or Business to them, as do our Committees.

10. The 10. Can: Counc. Carth. An: 397, declares *That if a Person who has appeal'd from one Ecclesiastical Tribunal, to other Ecclesiastical Judges of greater Authority, &c. And the Council of Carthage call'd the Fourth, held Anno 398, Can: 66, declares, That an Ecclesiastick who believes that his Bishop has condemn'd him unjustly, may have recourse to the Judgment of the Synod. And the Council of Carth. an. 418. Can. 9 ordains, That if Presbyters and Deacons, &c. complain of the Bishops Judgments, they shall be judged by their Neighbouring Bishops, and if they Appeal from this Judgment, it must be to the Council of Africa. Item placuit, ut Presbyteri, Diaconi, vel cæteri inferiores Clerici, in causis quas habuerint, si de iudicio Episcoporum suorum questi fuerint, vicini Episcopi eo audiant; Et inter eos quicquid est, finiant adhibiti ei ex consensu Episcoporum suorum. Quod si Et ab iis provocandum putaverint, non provocent nisi ad Apricana Concilia, vel ad Primate Provinciarum suarum. At transmarina autem qui putaverit appellandum, a nulli intra Apricam in communionem suscipiatur.* And the Council of Chalcedon, which is call'd *The fourth Oecumenical Council* Can: 9. declares, *That if any Clergy man have any thing against his Bishop, he should address himself to a provincial Synod, or if he hath any thing to do with his Metropolitan, or against the Provincial Synod he shall go to the Exarch of the Diocess, or have Recourse to the National Synod or General Assembly, In like manner*

manner, if a Person judge himself wronged by any of our Presbyteries, he may Appeal to the Provincial Synod, and if he thinks he is injured by the Synod, he may have recourse to the General Assembly, or National Synod for Remedy.

11. The 9. Can: Counc:an:418, cited a little before, ordains these to be Excommunicated who Appeal from the Synod of Africa, or General Assembly, to judge beyond the Seas. And the sixth Canon of the Council of Nice (as it is gloss'd by the African Bishops in their Letter to Pope Caeleſtine) speaks to the same purpose. Also the first Oecumenical Council at Constantinople, in their Canon 6. appoints, That the Accusation of a Bishop shall be carried to the Bishops of his own Province. And if the Bishops of the Province cannot judge of the Crimes whereof a Bishop is accused, recourse must be had to the Synod of the Diocese, which answers to our General Assembly; But if any slighting these Laws, shall address himself either to the Emperor or secular Judges, or shall desire any Oecumenical Council without acquiescing in the Judgment of the Bishops of the Diocese, he ought to be heard no longer, since he has violated the Canons, and overthrown the Discipline of the Church, ... ἀτιμάσαι τὸν τὴ Διοικήσεως Ἐπισκόπον τὸν τοιούτων τὸ παράπαν εἰς κατηγορίαν μὴ εἶναι δεκτὸν ὡς καθυβρί-
τάντα τὸν κανόνα καὶ τὴν ἐκκλησιαστικὴν λυμηνάμενον εὐταξίαν. And to the same purpose Counc:Carth.an. 407. Can. 11. And agreeably to these Canons it is not lawful to Appeal from our General Assembly.

I think I may now say, it is made sufficiently evident, That that Government which is commonly called Presbyterian Government, to wit, The Government of the Church by Presbyteries, Synods, General Assemblies, and Commissions of General Assemblies, is the very same Government that was in the Church in the third and fourth Centuries; and consequently if the Government of the Church in the third and fourth Centuries was Episcopal Government,

as it was certainly, our present Presbyterian Government is really and properly Episcopal Government.

Cyprian says in his first Epistle, *Cum jam pridem in concilio Episcoporum statum sit, ne quis de Clericis & Dei Ministris tutorem vel curatorem testamento suo constituat, quando singuli Divino Sacerdotio honorati, & in Clerico Ministerio constituti, non nisi Altari & Sacrificiis deservire, & precibus atque orationibus vacare debeant. Scriptum est enim, nemo militans Deo obligat se molestiis secularibus, ut possit placere ei, cui se probavit. Quod cum de omnibus dictum sit, quanto magis Clerici molestiis & laqueis secularibus obligari non debent, qui divinis rebus & spiritualibus occupati, ab Ecclesia recedere & ad terrenos & seculares actus vacare non possunt?* And a Council at Rome, as is suppos'd under Pope Innocent 1st. in their 10. Canon, forbids those to be ordain'd Bishops, that have exercised secular Functions, tho they should be chosen by the People; because their Approbation is of force only, when they choose one worthy of that Office. And the 7. Canon of the Oecumenical Council at Chalcedon, forbids these that have been ordain'd, and Monks, to take upon them any secular Office, μήτε ἐπὶ ἀξίαν κοσμικὴν ἔρχεσθαι. †

The 14. Canon of the Council of Sardica, ordains, That a Bishop shall not be three Weeks out of his Diocess. *Memini autem superiore Concilio fratres nostros constituisse, (inquit Hosius Episcopus) ut si quis Laicus in ea qua commoratur Civitate, tres Dominicas,*
i. e.

† Ἐπίσκοπος, ἢ πρεσβύτερος ἢ διάκονος κοσμικὰς φροντίδας μὴ ἀναλαμβάνετω, εἰ δὲ μὴ, καθαιρεῖται. Can. Apolt. 6 i, c. Episcopus, vel Presbyter, vel Diaconus, seculares curas non suscipiat, aliqui disponatur. The Prelatists pretend a great Veneration for the Apoltolical Canons, as they are call'd, but that is nothing, they can dispence with the most Ancient and Sacred Ecclesiastical Constitution when they please, and even with divers Appointments. No man that warrētē (says Paul to Timothy, who was a Bishop according to our Prelatists) entangleth himself with the affairs of this life, that he may please him who hath chosen him to be a Soullacer.

. e. per tres septimanas non celebrasset conventum, communionem privaretur. Si ergo hæc circa Laicos constituta sunt tanto magis nec licet nec decet, ut Episcopus nullam tam gravem habet necessitatem, nec tam difficiem rationem, tam diu desit ab Ecclesia, ne populum contristet. Universi dixerunt placere sibi. Even in the 9th. Century the Nonresidence of Bishops was condemn'd as a base abuse by a Synod at Rome under Eugenius 2. Their 6. Canon bears this title, *Ut Episcopi extra proprias Parochias non morentur*, and is to this purpose, Bishops should always reside in their Paroches, labouring in Piety to carry on their Edification, because the absence of the Bishop proves at times hurtful to the People,

And the Council at Carthage an: 398 Can: It ordains, that a Bishops household stuff shall be of little worth, his Table and Diet mean, and that he should acquire Authority by his Faith and Merit, and not by External Pomp. *Ut Episcopus vilem suppellectilem, & censuram ac victum pauperem habeat; &c.* And the 25. Can. of the Council of Antioch, an: 342, ordains that Bishops be Content with Necessaries. *μεταλαμβάνειν και αυτον των δεόντων, εις τας αναγκαίας αυτης ρείας.*

And the 45. Canon of the just now mention'd Council of Carthage, Forbids Clergy-men to distinguish themselves by their Habit.

By these Canons of Ancient Councils, you may judge whether the Presbyterian Ministers, or English Prelates look likest the Primitive Bishops.

C H A P. VIII.

The same thing is further evidenced, by comparing the Discipline of this Church with that of the Ancient Church in many Particulars.

AS the Presbyterian Church in *Scotland* has the same Episcopacy that the Ancient Church had, and the same kind of Ecclesiastical Courts, Presbyteries, Synods, and General Assemblies, &c. in like manner the Discipline of the Church of *Scotland*, or that which we call the Presbyterian Discipline, is very conform to the Ancient Discipline. This now is what we are intending to make appear in this Chapter, by comparing the Discipline of the Church of *Scotland* with that of the Ancient Church, by which it will be evident, that most, if not all the Acts of our General Assemblies, are very agreeable to the Canons of the Ancient Councils.

1. Our Church allows not Ordinations, *ad Ministerium vagum*, as they call it, or permits not a Person to be Ordain'd, unless he be call'd to a particular Post, to exert his Office in some Church or particular Congregation; conform to the 6. Canon of the Universal Council at *Chalcedon*, which forbids *The Ordination of any Clergy-man absolutely* (*μὴ δ' ἐνα δὲ ἀπολελυμένως χειροτονᾶσθαι, μήτε πρεσβύτερον, μήτε διάκονον, μήτε ὅλως τινὰ ἢ ἐν ἐκκλησιασικῷ τάγματι*, and without a Church Title, or who is not set apart for the Service of some Church, either in the City, or Coun-

try, or of some Chappel or Monastery; and declares these Ordinations void that are celebrated otherwise: And forbids them that are so ordain'd, to do the Functions of their Ministry, that they may conceal them from Disgrace that have ordain'd them. The Prelatists use to Presbyterate or Diaconate Persons who have no Ministerial Relation to any particular Church: But if the venerable Bishops of this Oecumenical Council were living, they would cast and disannul such irregular Ordinations, that so they might conceal the Disgrace of these who ordained them.

2. So does our Church mightily condemn *Pluralities*, one Person's possessing two Benefices, or taking the charge of two or more Churches at a time. Neither did the Fathers of the foresaid Council of Chalcedon approve such a Practice as may be evidently gather'd from their 10. Canon, which Prohibits *A Clergy-man to be Entitled to two Churches at one time*, μη ἐξεῖναι κληρικόν ἐν δύο πόλεων καταλέγεσθαι κλησίας κατὰ τὸ αὐτὸ, &c.) to that in which he was ordain'd, and that to which he is removed; and ordains that those who do it shall be obliged to return to their Church, or if they remain in the Church to which they are removed, they shall have nothing of the Revenue of the Church which they have left, nor of the Hospitals of that Church. This is also condemn'd by the 16. Council of Toledo, in the seventh Century, anno 693, in their 5th. Canon, which prohibits giving the Government of many Churches to one Presbyter, because he cannot perform the Work of the Ministry in them all, or be helpful to the People in the Sacramental Functions. Sed & hoc necessario instituendum elegimus, ut plures Ecclesiæ uni nequaquam committerentur presbytero; quia solus per totas Ecclesias nec officium debet persolvere, nec populis Sacerdotali jure occurrere; nec rebus earum necessariam curam impendere, &c. Now conform the Practice of the Church of England to their Canons, every Body knows, and yet the Flatter-

Flatterers of that Church are always making a Noise about Antiquity. It seems Wickedness never came to such a hight in *Africa*; wherefore, for ought I know, the Bishops there never had occasion to form any Canon against this hateful Abuse.

3. Tho' a Person have the Call of the People to a Church or Congregation, yet if he fix himself there upon that Call without the Authority of the Synod or Presbytery, he is condemn'd by our Church, however qualified he may be for the Post, and will be Depos'd for his Presumption and Rebellion. And this is agreeable to the 16 Canon of the Council of *Antioch* held about the year 342, which is conceived in these terms, *If a Bishop who has no Bishoprick, invade a vacant Church without the Authority of a Synod;* (ὑπαρπάζοι τὸν θρόνον δίχα συνόδου τελείας) *he ought to be driven away,* (τῷτον ἀπόβλητον εἶναι) *that the People of that Church should choose him.* (καὶ εἰ πᾶς ὁ λαὸς ἐλοιτο αὐτόν.) The Episcopal Obtruders in the North then, οἱ ἐπὶ χολάζουσας ἐκκλησίας ἑαυτοῖς ἐπιρρίψαντες, who cast themselves into Vacant Churches upon the Call of the People, without noticing either Presbytery or Synod, stand condemn'd by this Council, wherefore they who reverence the Authority of the Ancient Church, and have regard to Decency and Order, cannot but look on such Obtruders, and the Congregations who receive them, as a Factious and Schismatical kind of People who are for bringing the Church into Confusion, that they may serve Self-interest, or gratify a peevish Humour.

4. The General Assembly of this Church, anno 1638, ordains, *The Presbyteries to proceed with Church Censures, even to Excommunication against these Ministers who being Depos'd by the Assembly, submit not to their Sentence, but still exercise some part of the Ministerial Function.* This Act is nothing but a

reviving of the fourth Canon of the Council of *Antioch*, which ordains; *That in case a Bishop being Depos'd by a Synod, or a Presbyter or a Deacon being Depos'd by his Bishop, shall dare to discharge the Functions of their Offices before they be restor'd, can never hope to be restor'd in another Synod, that they shall not be permitted to defend themselves, and that all these shall be Excommunicated who have Communicated with them, and knew the Judgment that was given against them.* ἀλλὰ δὲ τοὺ κοινωνήντας αὐτῷ πάντας ἀποβάλλουσιν τὰς ἐκκλησίας καὶ μάλιστ' ἐμαθόντες τὴν ἀποφάσιν τὴν κατὰ τῶν προειρημένων ἐξενεχθεῖσαν τολμήσειαν αὐτοῖς κοινωνεῖν. This Canon also seems to be levelled against some of the Episcopal Clergy, and if there be any who join with such deposed Persons, they appear to be an ignorant and stubborn People, and deserve to be Excommunicated every one of them, in the Opinion of the Fathers of this Ancient Council.

5. If a Minister being Depos'd by the Presbytery, Synod, or Assembly, should have recourse to the Civil Magistrate, King or Parliament for Restauration, he would be look'd on by our Church as very unworthy of the Office in all time coming. And this agrees with the 12th. Canon of the same Council of *Antioch* which forbids Clergy-men who have been Depos'd by their Bishop to address themselves to the Emperor (ἐνοχλῆσαι τολμήσειε τὰς βασιλέως ἀκοὰς) to obtain Restitution, and takes from those who shall do it, all hopes of being restor'd. And with the 9th. Canon of the Council of *Carthage*, anno 397, which ordains, that if a Clergy-man being accus'd before the Ecclesiastical Tribunal, removeth the Cause to the Civil Magistrates, tho he even gain the Cause, he shall lose his Place. How far were Christians from being *Erafrican* in those Days?

6. A Minister would be condemn'd by our Church if he should invade his Neighbour's Parish, Preach, or Administer Sacraments, hold Session there, or the like, without being call'd thereto: Which is very Consonant with many Ancient Constitutions. Thus the foresaid Council of *Antioch*, in their 22d. Canon, Forbids a Bishop to meddle within the Diocess of another (ἐπίσκοπον μὴ ἐπιβαίνειν ἀλλοτρίᾳ πόλει τῇ μὴ ὑποκειμένη αὐτῷ) and to make any Ordination there. And the Council of *Carthage*, anno 397, Canon 20, forbids Bishops to undertake any thing in the Diocess of their Neighbours. *Placuit, ut a nullo Episcopo usurpentur Plebes alienæ, nec aliquis Episcoporum supergrediatur in diocesi suam Collegam.* And the Council of *Constantinople*, anno 383, in Can: 2d. forbids every Bishop in particular, to go out of the bounds of his own Country to ordain, or to meddle with the Affairs of the Churches in another Diocess. ταῖς ὑπερορίαις ἐκκλησίαις μὴ ἐπιέναι μηδὲ συγχέειν τὰς ἐκκλησίας. To the same purpose the Council of *Carthage*, anno 390. Can: ii. Yet if invited, Ministers may Preach and Administer Sacraments, &c. in stranger Congregations, contrary to the groundless Fancies of the Independents, but consonantly to the 33d. Canon of the 4th. Council of *Carthage*, viz. That the Bishops and Presbyters, who are forced to go into their Neighbours Churches, shall be received and invited to Preach and to Celebrate the Eucharist there. *Tam ad verbum faciendum, quam ad oblationem consecrandam invitentur.* Thus *Anicetus* Bishop of *Rome* invited *Polycarp* to celebrate the Eucharist when he was occasionally there. *Euseb: Hist: Eccl: l. 5. C. 24.*

7. Any of our Ministers or Bishops would be condemn'd if they should encroach upon any Village of a Neighbouring Paroch or Diocess, and attempt to bring it under their own Jurisdiction: As the Council of *Carthage*, anno 397, prohibited Bishops
usur-

usurpare Plebes alienas : And the Council of Carthage, anno 348, in their 10th. Canon, to invade the Bounds of the Neighbouring Dioceſſes. *Proinde inhibendum eſt, ne quis alienos fines uſurpet aut tranſcendat Episcopum Collegam ſuum, aut uſurpet alterius Plebes, ſine ejus petitu, uniuerſi dixerunt, placet, placet.*

8. The Church of Scotland allows Transportations of Biſhops or Miniſters in caſe of Neceſſity, or when the Good of the Church requires it. So did the fourth Council of Carthage in their 27th. Canon, which forbids the Transportations of Biſhops which are made through Ambition ; and as for thoſe which are made for the good of the Church, it ſays, they ought to be made upon the requeſt of the Clergy and People. by the order of the Synod. *Ut Episcopuſ de loco ignobili ad nobilem, per ambitionem non tranſeat, nec quiſquam inferioris ordinis clericuſ. Sane ſi id utilitas Eccleſiæ fiendum poſoſcerit, decreto pro eo Clericorum & Laicorum Episcopis porrecto, in præſentia (i. e. per ſententiam) Synodi tranſferatur, nihilominuſ alio in loco ejus Episcopuſ ſubrogato.* Which agrees moſt exactly with the Practice of the Church of Scotland.

9. Biſhops or Miniſters with uſ cannot chooſe their own Succeſſors ; Neither could the Ancient Biſhops. Thus the Council of Antioch, in their 23d. Canon, forbids a Biſhop to ordain his Succeſſors, tho he be come to the end of his days, declaring, that this cannot be done but by the Authority of the Synod, which has power to promote one that is worthy, when the incumbent is removed by Death. Thus the Council at Rome under Pope Hilarius in their laſt Canon, forbids Biſhops chooſing their Succeſſors, againſt the abuſe which was then creep'd in in Spain. *Denique nonnulli Episcopatuſ, qui non niſi meritiſ præcedentibuſ datur, non diuinuſ munuſ ſed hæreditariuſ putanteſſe compendiuſ, & credunt, ſicut reſ caducaſ atque mortaleſ, ita ſacerdotiuſ, velut legatorio aut. teſtamentario jure, poſſe dimitti.* Nam plerique ſacerdoteſ in mortis con-

finio constituti, in locum suum feruntur alios designatis nominibus subrogare, ut scilicet non legitima expectetur electio, sed defuncti gratificatio pro populi habeatur assensu. Quod quam grave sit æstimate. Atque ideo si placet, etiam hanc licentiam generaliter de Ecclesiis auferamus.

10. The Scottish Assembly in the year 1694, Sef. 8. ordains *Presbyteries in all Processes against Ministers or Bishops to proceed with all due Circumspection and Prudence.* This Act is the same upon the matter with the 6th. Canon of the second Council of Carthage, which forbids the admitting any Persons of bad Reputation as accusers of Bishops. *Ab universis Episcopis dictum est, si criminosus est non admittatur: omnibus placet.*

11. The General Assembly of the Church of Scotland in the year 1698, Sef. 8. made an Act anent punctual sending of Commissioners or Deputies to the General Assemblies, and their Attendance during the sitting thereof; conform to the 43d. Canon of the Council of Carthage, anno 397, which is against those who satisfy themselves with governing their Diocess without attending on Councils. And Canon 21. of the Council there, anno 398, which bears, *That a Bishop ought not to Dispense with his going to the Synod, unless there be great Necessity.* Thus Codex Can: Eccles. Afric. Item placuit, ut quotiescunque concilium congregandum est, Episcopi, qui neque ætate, neque ægritudine, neque aliqua graviori necessitate impediuntur competenter occurrant. Quod si non poterint occurrere, excusationes suas in tractoria conscribant. Which is our way. The Scottish Assembly in the same Act appoints that each Assembly nominate a Committee to Judge these who either come not to the Assembly, or attend not duly when there. In like manner the Council at Carthage, anno 407, in their 6th. Canon, nominates Judges to examine the

Busi.

Business of certain Deputies who came not to the Council.

12. The Assembly of this Church in the year 1647, ordains, that every Deputy, who shall be absent from the Assembly without a reasonable Excuse, shall be suspended until the Provincial Synod next thereafter following. And the Council of Tarraco, anno 516, made such an other Canon. A Bishop, who neglects to come to a Synod, and is not detained by any Sickness, ought to be deprived of the Communion of his Brethren until the next Synod. *Censuerunt, usque ad futurum Concilium cunctorum Episcoporum Charitatis Communionem priuetur.* To the same purpose the 35 Canon of the Council of Agatha, anno. 506, admitting one's being sent for by the King as a relevant Excuse of absence,

13. Our Church permits not Laick Persons either to Baptize or Administer the Eucharist. Thus Apost. Const. lib. 3. cap. 10. *We allow not a Laick Person to perform any Sacerdotal Function, whether to offer Sacrifice. i. e. to Administer the Eucharist, or to Baptize, &c.* Basil was of the same mind, for in an Epistle to Amphilochius Bishop of Iconium, viz. Canon 1st. speaking of the Opinion of Cyprian, Firmilian and others who were for the Re-baptization of these that were Baptized by Hereticks, he says, *They, to wit, Cyprian, &c. ordain'd that they, to wit, who were Baptized by Hereticks, should be purified new by the true Baptism of the Church, as if they had been Baptized before by Laicks only.* It is true Tertullian was of Opinion that Laicks might Baptize in case of Necessity, but is against Women's taking upon them to Administer that Sacrament. *De Bapt. c. 17.* And the Council of Carthage. anno 398, in their 100 Canon, say, *Let not a Woman presume to Baptize, Mulier baptizare non præsumat.* And the Council of Saragosa, anno 381, forbids Women to meddle with teaching and expounding Articles of Faith

Faith. *Nec ad ipsas legentes alii studio vel docend vel discendi convenient: quoniam hoc Apostolus jubet.*

14. Neither doth our Church allow Deacons to Administer the Sacraments. *Tertullian* does indeed say, That a Bishop might imploy a Deacon to Baptize, *Lib. de Bap. c. 17*, but that was manifestly contrary to the Primitive Institution of that Office *Acts ch. 6*. And the Council of *Nice* says expressly in their 18th. Canon, That it does not belong to the Deacons to Administer the Eucharist, *καὶ ἐξέσια μὴ ἔχοντας προσεργεν*. And the Council of *Arles*, anno. 314, in their 15th. Canon, expressly prohibits the Deacons to Administer that Sacrament *De Diaconibus quos cognovimus multis locis offerre placuit, minime fieri debere*. And seing the Sacrament of Baptism is of the same Nature with that of the Eucharist, they who have no Right to Administer the one, can have no Right to Administer the other. Wherefore the Practice of the Church of *England* as to this particular, or their empowering Deacons to Baptize, but not to Administer the Supper or Eucharist, is contrary to common Sense.

15. Our Church permits not Presbyters or ruling Elders to Preach or Administer Sacraments. Neither doth this much contradict the practice of the Ancient Church, at least in the first three Centuries. For seing all the Episcopal Diocesses then were only Congregational Churches, and the Bishops did officiate constantly as the Pastors, the Presbyters had not access to Preach, &c. but accidentally and very seldom. And does not *Tertullian* plainly declare, that in his time the Sacrament of the Eucharist us'd to be administered by none but the Bishops? *Nec de aliorum manu quam Præsidentium sumimus*, saith he, viz. *Eucharistiæ Sacramentum*. And says an eminently Learn'd Divine, "If in the East the Presbyters were allowed to Preach, it was otherwise in the West, for there the Bishop
" them

themselves performed that Work for many Ages. The first Presbyter that ever was permitted to Preach publickly in *Africa*, was *Augustin*, and this he did by the Permission of his Bilhop *Valerius*, who was a Greek by Birth, and that was judged an irregular thing, it being contrary to the use and practice of the Churches of *Africa*, that Presbyters should be permitted to Preach, as *Possidius* observes in the Life of *Augustin*. M. Larroque *onfor: de la Discipl: des Pr: de Fr: avec celle des Anc: bret.*

16. The General Assembly of this Church, in the year 1690, forbids private use of the Sacraments, and first of Baptism, prohibiting the Administration of that Sacrament in private Houses, or any where out in the Church or Congregation. And that Act was a reviving of the 59 Canon of the Oecumenical or Universal Council call'd, *Quini-Sextum*, which Canon is formed thus, *μηδαμῶς ἐν ευκτηρίῳ οἴκῳ δόν οἰκίας τυγχάνοντι βάπτισμα ἐπιτελεῖσθαι, ἀλλ' οἱ μέλλοντες ἀξιῶντες τῷ ἀχράντῳ φωτισματὸς αἷς καθολικαῖς προσερχεσθῶσαν ἐκκλησίαις, κακῆσε δωρεᾶς ταύτης ἀπολαύσωσαν: εἰ δ' ἐτις ὁλῶ τὰς ἡμῶν ὀριζέμεντα μὴ φυλάττων, εἰ μὲν κληρικὸς εἴη, αἵρεσιδα, εἰ δ' ἐλαϊκὸς ἀφορίζεσθαι.* That is, Let not baptism be administred in a private Oratory, or Chappel in any House, but let those who shall be thought worthy of that pure Light go to the Catholick Churches (that is the Parish Churches, or the House in which the Congregation uses to Assemble) and enjoy this Gift here, and let the breakers of this Act be depos'd, if they be Clergy-men, and Excommunicated if they be Laicks. And if these Fathers thought it unlawful to administer that Sacrament in Oratories or private happels, how much more would they have judged it unlawful and disorderly to Administer that Sacrament in private Chambers? The Episcopal People of *Scotland* must know then, that their Clergy Act Dis-

Disorderly, are Rebels against the Discipline of the Ancient Church, and Contemners and Despisers of the Authority of Universal Councils, by baptizing Children in private Houses, and tempting us to transgress Order sometimes, by instigating ignorant and obstinate Persons to Clamour against us if we do not gratify their Humour in administering Baptism privately according to the Episcopal Fashion, or rather Abuse. *Philip's Baptizing the Eunuch, Acts Ch. 8.* says nothing for justifying private Baptisms, according to the Opinion of this Universal Council, and they were in the Right, because the Eunuch, tho he was a Member of the Universal Church, was not a Member of any particular Church or Congregation, wherefore it was not needful that he should go to any particular Church in order to be Baptized.

17. The same Assembly did by the same Act prohibit the Celebration of the Sacrament of the Eucharist in a private way, conform to the 58 Canon of the Council of *Laodicea* in the year 360, or thereabout, which forbids both Bishops and Presbyters to make the Oblation, or Celebrate the Eucharist in private Houses, *ὅτις δὲ ἐν τοῖς οἰκοῖς προσφορὰς γίνεσθαι ὡρᾷ ἐπισκόπων ἢ πρεσβυτέρων.* And the Council of *Saragosa* Anathematizes, these who having received the Eucharist did not Eat it in the Church, in their 3d. Canon, *Eucharistia gratiam, si quis probatur acceptam in Ecclesia non sumpsisse, Anathema sit in perpetuum. Ab universis Episcopis dictum est placet.* This manifestly insinuates that they might not Celebrate this Sacrament any where but in the Church; for it is ridiculous to suppose that they would leave a Liberty to People to take this Sacrament in private Houses, and not to Eat it. In like manner, *Justinian Nov: 58,* Forbids the Celebration of the Holy Mysteries in private Houses. Wherefore they who Administer the Sacrament of the Eucha

ist to Persons on Death-bed, as they abuse this Sacrament, so they make it appear that they have but very little regard to the practice or Authority of the Ancient Church, what ever they may pretend.

18. The Ministers or Bishops of this Church are appointed to Catechize those who come to present their Children to Baptism, and to instruct them concerning the Nature of the Sacrament, &c. according to the 54th. Canon of the Council at Paris in the year 829. *Quod hi qui fidem Christi expetunt, & provectæ ætatis existunt, priusquam ad Baptismum accedant, instruendi sint & fidei & Baptismatis Sacramento, necnon & illi, qui alios de sacro fonte suscipiunt, quique ad percipiendum Sancti Spiritus Donum, coram Pontificibus pro aliis Patroni existunt, intelligere debent & vim tanti Sacramenti & quid pro aliis sponderint.*

19. According to the Discipline of this Church, these who are lying under any Scandal, cannot present their Children to Baptism, or be Sponsors for them, till they profess their Repentance, and be absolved or received again into the Peace of the Church. Thus it is added in this same 54th. Canon of the Council of Paris, *Illos tamen in hoc Capitulo specialiter ab his officiis removendos, judicamus, qui propter reatum suum publica pœnitentia sunt mulctati, videlicet ut nec alios de sacri fontis baptismo suscipiant, nec etiam ad percipiendum sancti spiritus donum, aliorum Patroni coram Pontificibus existant donec per dignam pœnitentiæ satisfactionem, reconciliationem mereantur.*

20. The Acts of our Assembly forbid the Admission of Scandalous Persons to the Table of the Lord. In like manner the Fathers of the Council of Laodicea, in their 19th Canon, say, That none but these who are Holy shall be suffered to approach the Altar to receive the Communion, *καὶ μόνοις ἑξόν τοῖς ἁγαινοῖς εἰσελταί εἰς τὸ θυσιαστήριον καὶ κοινωνεῖν.*

21. The Members of another Congregation, and new incomers into a Parish, are not allowed by our Acts of Assembly to be admitted to Communion, unless they bring Testificates concerning their Christian Behaviour from the Bishop or Pastor of the Parish from which they came or to which they belong. And thus the Council of *Carthage*, anno 348, Canon 7th. A Presbyter or a Layman of another Diocess shall not be received into Communion, unless he have a Letter from his own Bishop, *Casianus Ufulensis dixit, statuat gravitas vestra ut unusquisque Clericus vel Laicus, non communicet in aliena Plebe, sine literis Episcopi sui.* And the Council of *Antioch*, Canon 7th. No Person shall be received into Communion who has not Letters of Peace, *μὴ δέσιν ἀπὸ τοῦ ἐκκλησιαστικοῦ δέχεται ὁ ἕκαστος, Sine commendatitiis,* or Letters testifying that he is not separated from the Communion of the Church. And the 13th. Canon of the Council of *Chalcedon*, forbids to receive strange and unknown Clergy-men without Commendatory Letters from their Bishops.

22. These who attend the Ordinances and Preaching of the Word, but do not Communicate, or take the Sacrament of the Supper, incur Censure by the Acts and Laws of this Church, even the highest if they continue in that Sin after due Admonition and Exhortations. And thus the Council of *Toledo* in the year 400, ordains in their 13th. Canon, That those who come to the Church, and do not receive the Communion shall be admonished, that they must either Communicate, or be put in the rank of Penitents, and if they will do neither, they shall be Excommunicated. *De his qui intrant in Ecclesiam, & deprehenduntur nunquam communicare, admoneantur. Quod si non Communicant, ad pœnitentiam accedant. Si communicant, non semper abstineantur. Si non fecerint, abstineantur.* And in their 14th. Canon, they ordain, That he shall be driven away as a Sacrilegious Person, who having received the Eucharist from the hand

hand of the Bishop does not eat it, which is very agreeable to the Sense of the Judicatories of this Church.

23. Our Assemblies allow no Books to be read publickly in the Church, but these that are Canonical, and forbid the reading of such as are Apocryphal, as also the singing of Psalms of humane Composition in the Church or Congregation. And this according to the 59 Canon of the Council of *Laodicea*, to wit, *Private Psalms ought not to be sung in Churches, nor any Books read there which are not Canonical, but only the Canonical Books of the Old and New Testament*: Then they set down the Names of the Books they look on as, and affirm to be, Canonical, which are the very same that we and other Protestant Churches own as such, only they mention not the Book of the Revelation. Ὅτι ὁ δὲ ἰδιωτικῶς ψαλμοὺς λέγει ἐν τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ, καὶ ἀκανονιστὰ βιβλία, ἀλλὰ μόνον τὰ κανονικὰ τῆς καινῆς καὶ παλαιᾶς διαθήκης. How well this Canon is observed by the Prelatists every Body knows.

24. In our Church none are permitted to read the Scriptures publickly in the Congregation, but these who may expound, or are endued with the Power of Preaching. And tho this Practice is mightily condemn'd by some among us who know no better, and make groundless Fancies their Rule in many things, it would not have been condemned by the Primitive Churches, as is evident from what *Sozomen* observes (*Hist: Eccl: lib. 7. C. 19.*) *In multis autem Ecclesiis soli duntaxat Presbyteri, alicubi in principis festivitatis Episcopi legunt. i. e.* In many Churches the Presbyters only, and in some the Bishops read the Scriptures on the principal Festival Days. And as sure as our Prelatical People think themselves, and notwithstanding all their Outcries against the Presbyterians, their Practice with respect to this Particular, is more opposite to that of the Ancient Church, than the Presbyterian Practice is. They contradict the practice of the

Ancient Church here in two things. 1. They cause the Scriptures to be Read in the Churches by Readers who are not of the Clergy, and who are not ordain'd Persons. Whereas the Ancient Lectores or Readers were Clergy-men, Witness Mr. *Dodwell*, *Observandum insuper* (saith he, *Dissert: Cypr. 6. N. 11.*) *ex eodem hoc Cypriani loco, Lectores etiam atque hypodiaconos generali Clericorum titulo censer*; and says *Cyprian*, *Epist: 38*, with respect to the Ordination of the Reader *Aurelius*, *In Ordinationibus Clericis, Fratres Charissimi, solemus vos ante consulere, &c.* 2. They begin the reading of Scripture before the Congregation is assembled, and the President of the Assembly, or Minister or Bishop is come in. Whereas in Ancient times Divine Worship, or reading of Scripture did not begin till the Bishop came in, according to the Presbyterian Practice. Thus the 56 Canon of the Council of *Laodicea* ordains, That the Presbyters shall not enter into the Church before the Bishop come, *Non oportet Presbyteros ante ingressum Episcopi ingredi & sedere in tribunalibus, sed cum Episcopo ingredi, &c.* And if the Presbyters might not go into the Church before the Bishop came, much more might not the Deacons, Readers, and the inferior Clergy. Then this Canon would have been ridiculous, if the Worship of God used to begin before the coming of the Bishop: And seeing, as *Sozomen* says, None but the Presbyters did Read in many Churches, and no Presbyter might enter the Church before the coming of the Bishop, is evident, that in the Ancient Christian Assemblies, they did not begin to read the Scriptures publicly, till the Bishop or Minister, or he who was to Preach came in and mounted the Pulpit. Moreover, *Sozomen* says, That the Bishops us'd to arise when the reading of the Scriptures did begin in the Church, which manifestly supposeth that they did not read till the Bishop was come, according to the Presbyterian

terian Practice. *Est etiam apud Alexandrinos hoc novum atque insolens: Dum enim leguntur Evangelia non assurgit Episcopus, quod tamen alibi nusquam fieri, neque vidi neque audiui. Sozom: ibid.* And if the Presbyterians be blam'd because they want Readers, our Prelatical People must know that they are so much the more conform to the Ancient Church on that account, for the having of the Office of Readers was a Corruption which creep'd into the Church not long before *Cyprian's* time.

25. Our Assemblies, and particularly in the year 1645, recommend and enjoin Uniformity in publick Worship. So did the Council at *Venice* about the year 461, in their 15th. Canon, There shall, say they, be one way only of celebrating Divine Service, and Singing in all the Province. *Rectum quoque duximus, ut vel intra Provinciam nostram, Sacrorum & ordinis psallendi una sit consuetudo, ut sicut unam cum Trinitatis Confessione fidem tenemus unam & officiorum regulam teneamus, ne variata observatione, in aliquo observatio nostra discrepare credatur.* Wherefore if there should be Organs in the Churches, they should be in all the particular Churches or Congregations without Exception, and if that cannot be, there should be no Organs in any Church at all, according to this Ancient Canon.

26. Every Body knows, that the Assemblies of this Church enjoin a strict Observation of the Sabbath, they have made particular Acts against Sporting or Gaming on that day, against Labour whether in Seed time or Harvest, going of Mills, Fishing, looting ships, &c. And thus the second Council of *Mascon*, anno 585, says in their first Canon, Let no Person prosecute any suit of Law on this Day, let none follow their own Business, let none yoke Oxen, but let all the World apply themselves to Sing the Praises of God: Let every one run to the nearest Church to shed Tears there; Let your Eyes and your Hands be lifted up to the Lord, &c. Afterward

ward they decree Penalties against those who break the Sabbath Day, according to the State and Condition of the Persons : If he be an Advocate, they order that he shall be drawn from the Bar ; if he be a Peasant, that he receive Blows with a Stick ; if he be a Monk, that he be Excommunicated for six Months. Then they exhort Christians to spend even the Sabbath Night in Prayers. *Videmus enim Populum Christianum temerario more diem Dominicam contemptui tradere, & sicut in privatis diebus, operibus continuis indulgere : Propterea per hanc Synodalem nostram Epistolam decernimus, ut unusquisque nostrum in Sacrosanctis Ecclesiis admoneat sibi subditam Plebem. Omnes itaque Christiani, qui non incassum hoc nomine fruimini, nostræ admonitioni aurem accommodate, scientes quoniam nostræ est autoritatis, utilitati vestræ prospicere, & a malis operibus coercere. Custodite diem Dominicam, quæ nos denuo peperit, & a peccatis omnibus liberavit. Nullus vestrum litium fomitibus vacet, nullus causarum actiones exerceat, nemo sibi talem necessitatem exhibeat, quæ jugum Cervicibus jumentorum imponere cogat. Estote omnes in hymnis & laudibus Dei animo corporeque intenti. Si quis vestrum proximam habet Ecclesiam, properet ad eandem, & ibi Dominico die semetipsum precibus lachrymisque afficiat, Sint oculi manusque vestræ toto illo die ad deum expansæ. Siquis itaque vestrum hanc Salubrem exhortationem parvi penderit, aut contemptui tradiderit, sciat se pro qualitatibus merito principaliter a Deo puniri, & deinceps sacerdotali quoque iræ & implacabiliter subjacere. Si causidicus fuerit, irreparabiliter causam amittet. Si rusticus aut servus, gravioribus fustium ictibus verberabitur, si clericus aut Monachus, mensibus sex a consortio suspendetur Fratrum, &c.* Such Men as Bishop Laud, who were for debauching the People, and setting out a *Book of Sports* for the Sabbath Day, would not have been thought worthy of the Communion of the Church in those Days. Thus the Council of *Châlon* in the 7th. Cent. Canon 18th. forbids

forbids Plowing, Shearing Corn, Reaping or Tilling the Ground on Sabbath Days. *Instituimus ut in ipso die Dominico, ruralia Opera, i. e. arare, messes metere, exactus facere, vel quicquid ad ruris culturam pertinet, nullus penitus præsumat. Quod qui inventus fuerit faciens, &c.*

26. These also incur the Censure of our Church, who absent from the publick Worship three Sabbaths together, without some reasonable Excuse. And the 21st. Canon of the Ancient Council of *Eliberis*, which was held in the year 305, is to this purpose: If any Inhabitant of a City shall be absent from the Church, for three Sabbaths together, he shall be separated from the Communion for some time, to signify that he has been punished for his Fault. *Si quis in Civitate positus, per tres Dominicas Ecclesiam non accesserit, pauco tempore abstineat, ut correptus esse videatur.*

27. And if any Person leave the Church in time of Sermon, or go out before the pronouncing of the Blessing, he is censurable by the Acts of our Judicatories. In like manner the Council of *Orleans*, anno 511, made an Act against such undecent Carriage, in their Canon 26, *The People shall not go forth in the time of Divine Service, until it be finished, and they have received the Bishop's Blessing.*

28. If the Congregation were to go about Divine Worship, if any Member thereof should at any time prefer going to a Play or Show, he would be reckon'd worthy of Censure by this Church. Thus the Council of *Carthage*, anno 398, in Canon 88, says, *Let him be Excommunicated who forsakes the Assembly of the Church to be present at Shows.*

29. There are some who think that our Assemblies had little thing to do when they condemned the Observation of Superstitious Days, such as the first of January, Yule or Christmas Day, &c. No doubt these Persons are much Wiser than the venerable Fathers

Fathers the Bishops assembled in the second Council of *Tours* in the sixth Century, whose second Canon is levelled against the Superstition of these who Honour the Calends of *January*, and all those who observe Pagan Rites and Customs. *Enim vero quoniam cognovimus nonnullos inveniri sequepedas erroris antiqui, qui Kalend. Januarii colunt, cum Janus homo Gentilis fuerit, Rex quidem sed Deus esse non potuit. Quisquis ergo unum Deum Patrem regnantem cum filio & Spiritu Sancto credit, certe hic non potest integer Christianus dici, qui aliqua de gentilitate custodit.*—Contestamur illam sollicitudinem, tam Pastores quam Presbyteros gerere ut quemcunque in hac fatuitate persistere viderint, vel nescio ad quas petras, aut arbores, aut ad fontes, designata loca gentilium perpetrare quæ ad Ecclesiæ rationem non pertinent, eos ab Ecclesia sancta auctoritate repellant, nec participare Sancto altario permittant, qui Gentilium observationes Custodiunt. In like manner the Council of *Antisiodorum*, in the year 578, Canon. 1st. forbids to play at Pagan Sports, or to give New-year's Gifts, &c. *Non licet Kalend. Januarii Vecola aut Cervolo facere, vel strenas Diabolicas observare, &c.* Neither can I reckon the 25 day of *December* any other but the Pagan day, seing it is certain that Christ was not Born on that day, at least we have no ground at all to think that He was Born in that Month rather than any other Month of the Year; and seing the Prelatists and Papists Celebrate it in a Paganish way by Feasting and Revelling, which is to use the Words of the Council of *Tours*, *ad Ecclesiæ rationem non pertinet.*

30. Carding and Dicing, and such Games of Chance, and all manner of Lotry are prohibited by the Judicatories of this Church, and that according to the 79 Canon of the Ancient Council of *Eliberis*, which forbids playing at Games of Chance, and declares, that if any of the Faithful play at Dice, or make profession of playing at such Games, he shall be

be deprived of Communion, but if he forsakes this Custom, he may be reconciled at the end of one Year. *Si quis fidelis alea, i. e. tabula luserit nummos, placuit eum abstinere; Et si emendatus cessaverit, post annum poterit reconciliari communioni.* And the Universal Council called *Quini--Sextum* in their Canon 50, forbids those of the Clergy and the Laity to play at any Games of hazard, on pain of Excommunication, and Deposition, *μηδέναι τῶν ἀπάντων εἴτε λαϊκῶν εἴτε κληρικῶν κυβεύειν ὑπὸ τῶν νῦν; εἰ δὲ τις τῶν παραβῇ πρᾶττων, εἰ μὲν κληρικὸς εἴη, καθαιρεῖται, εἰ δὲ λαϊκός, ἀφορίζεται.*

31. Superstitious Practices also, all manner of Witch-craft, Charms, Divination and telling of Fortunes, or any thing that looks like Commerce with the Devil, are straitly prohibited, and Persons guilty of such things, are ordered to be severely Prosecuted by the Judicatories of this Church, Thus the Council of *Ancyra*, anno 314, in their 24 Canon, orders these to remain in the state of Penitents for five years, who meddle with Divination, and practise Superstitious Actions. *Qui auguria vel auspicia sive somnia vel Divinationes quaslibet, secundum morem gentilium observant, aut in domos suas hujusmodi homines introducunt in exquirendis aliquibus arte malefica, aut ut domos suas lustrent, confessi, quinquennio pœnitentiam agant secundum regulas antiquitus constitutas.* And thus the Council of *Venice* about the year 461, in their 16 Canon, order that such Persons shall be excluded from the Church, as pretend to Prophecie and Foretell things, whether it be by Auguries or other Superstitious Ceremonies, call'd the Saints Lots, or by any other way whatsoever.

32. Also the Judicatories of this Church have made several Acts against Revellings, Lascivious, Light and undecent Dancings, and such abuses at Marriages, &c. conform to the 53 Canon of the

Council of *Laodicea*, which forbids Christians to behave themselves disorderly at Marriage-Fests, to make a Noise, or to Dance there, but take their re-past Modestly. Ὅτι ὁ δὲ χριστιανὸς εἰς γάμους ἀπερχομένους, βαλλίζειν ἢ ὀρχεῖσθαι, ἀλλὰ σεμνῶς δεπνῆν ἢ ἀρῖσθαι, ὡς πρέπει χριστιανὸς.

33. The People of this Nation at the Reformation were careful to demolish the Monuments of Idolatry, or to deface the Places abused to Superstition in the time of Popery: And this was no ways contrary to the Humour of our Assemblies, which have made Acts expressly ordering such Monuments to be pull'd down. I have hear'd some, who reckon'd themselves wiser than their Neighbours, reflect on this as a Piece of peevish and impertinent Presbyterian Zeal: Nevertheless I have a strong Propensity to believe, that as much regard should be had to the Opinion of the Ancient *African* Bishops, who resolved to Petition the Emperor to give orders that such Monuments of Idolatry might be demolished: *Placuit ab Imperatoribus gloriosissimis peti, ut reliquiae Idololatriæ, non solum in simulacris, sed & in quibuscunque locis, vel lucis vel arboribus, omni modo deleantur. Codex Can: Eccl: Afric: Can: 84.*

34. According to the Discipline and Laws of this Church, these Persons that have been most Scandalous and Guilty of the greatest Crimes, may be received and admitted to Communion, if they give any Evidences of sincere Repentance. Thus the Council of *Carthage*, anno 397, Canon 35, The Grace of Reconciliation shall not be denied to Sorcerers, Comedians, and other infamous Persons, nor even to Apostates, when they are Converted. *Ut scenici atque bistrionibus, cæterisque hujusmodi personis, vel Apostaticis, conversis vel reversis ad Dominum, gratia vel reconciliatio non negetur.* And the Council of *Anjou* in the year 433, Canon 12, decrees, *That all Persons*

sons who will be Converted shall be received to Penance, and shall be granted Absolution according to the Discretion of the Bishop.

35. And according to our Rules, Persons guilty of publick Scandals cannot be received into the Peace of the Church, till they make publick Confession, and profess their Repentance before the Congregation, † and receive a Rebuke in the presence of all. This is conform to the Apostolical Canon or direction. *Them that Sin reboke before all.* And *Tertullian* describing a Christian Assembly or Church, in his *Apol: C. 39*, says, *There also are Exhortations, Rebukes, and the Infliction of Divine Censure.* And Persons thus guilty, were not admitted to Penance, or to make publick profession of Repentance in order to Absolution, unless they desired it, as appears from the 15 Canon of the Council of *Agatha* or *Agda*, which ordains, *That Penitents at such time as they desire Penance* (*tempore quo pœnitentiam petunt*) *shall receive Imposition of hands from the Bishop, sicut ubique constitutum est.* And when they were received into the Peace of the Church, they were received Publickly in the face of the Congregation, as is evident from the 3 Canon of the Council of *Carthage*, *anno 397*, *Penitents whose Crimes are very publick, and known by all the Church, shall receive Imposition of hands in a high Place near the*

Q q 2

Bishops

† Before that the Penitents were received to the Peace of the Church, they pass'd through several degrees. (1) They were made to stand some time without the Church at the Gate, and when they were kept there for a time longer or shorter, according to the Nature of their Scandal, and the Evidences of the Sincerity of their Repentance. (2) They were brought within the Church, and set by themselves, in that Part where the Catechumens did sit, where they might hear sermon. Then (3) after a competent time, they were brought within the Rails, to a Place behind that in which the People did sit; and after they had continued there for some time, (4) They were brought into the Place where the People were, permitted to join in all the Prayers, but not to communicate, and after this they were received by Imposition of Hands and Prayer. See *Spanb.* on the 4th Cent: C. 7. Colum. 861. Many think that the Discipline of this Church is too severe on scandalous Persons, but you may see hence that it is vastly short of that of the Ancient Church, even in the 4th Century.

*Bishop's Throne. Ut Presbyter, inconsulto Episcopo, non reconciliet pœnitentem, nisi absente Episcopo, & cogente necessitate. Cujuscunque autem pœnitentis publicum & vulgatissimum crimen est, quod universa Ecclesia noverit, ante absidam manus ei imponatur. **

36. According to the Acts of our Assembly, Penitents are to appear more or less frequently before the

* It is evident from this Canon, that the greater part of the Episcopal Diocesses in *Africa* towards the end of the Fourth, and beginning of the Fifth Century, were but Parochial Diocesses, or consisted of one Congregation only. Can this Canon be obeyed or put in Execution by the Modern Prelates? How ridiculous a thing would it have been, and useless and senseless, if all the scandalous Persons, all the Drunkards, Swearers, Fornicators, &c. in the three *Lotbians, Merce* and *Tweddale* Shires, had been obliged to appear every time in the Cathedral Church at *Edinburgh*, near the Bishop's Throne or Pulpit, to profess Repentance, and be rebuked in order to Reconciliation? How could such Multitudes of Persons appear there? what way would the Church contain them, how could they remain there for such a long time as the Canons obliged Penitents to attend? What a Toil would it have been to the Bishop to lay on hands on so many People? how could he judge concerning the sincerity of their Repentance, &c.? We cannot think that the *African* Bishops would have been such Dancers as to make such a Canon as this, if their Diocesses consisted of many Congregations, as is pretended. The same Inference may be made from Multitudes of other Canons; I instance only one Example or two. In the 19. Canon of the Council of *Laodicea*, 'tis said, *That after the Bishop's Sermon, Prayers shall be made for the Catechumens apart by themselves, and after the Catechumens are gone forth, Prayers shall be made for the Penitents, &c. After that the Peace shall be given, and when the Presbyters shall give it to the Bishop, the Laity shall give it to themselves, and afterwards the Oblation or Eucharist shall go on, &c.* Hence we may see, that in every Place where there was Sermon, Catechumens, Penitents, and an Altar or Communion Table, that is, in every Congregation there was a Bishop to preach; if there had been Congregations in which Presbyters preached for ordinar, it would have been said, *after the Bishop's or Presbyter's Sermon.* And all the Presbyters in the Diocess were in the same Congregation with the Bishop, for they gave him the Peace every time after Sermon. And in the 50th Canon of this Council it is said, *That the Presbyters ought not to enter the Church, nor sit down in the Seat, until the Bishop come, and that they shall go in with the Bishop, unless he be sick or absent.* Hence it is evident, that the Bishop and all his Presbyters had but one Congregation or Church, in which they used all to be personally present, when Divine Service was to be gone about. Thus the 7th Canon of the Council of *Arles*, Anno 314. Permits the Faithful to enter upon Offices, but upon Condition that the Bishop of the Place, where they shall take an Office, shall superintend their Conduct, and that if they do any thing contrary to the Discipline of the Church, they shall be separated from his Communion. How could a Bishop superintend the Conduct of any Christian that might be in a secular Office within his Diocess, and observe his Carriage, unless his Diocess was one Congregation only? And the 30th Canon of the first Council of *Orange* ordains, *That if a Bishop lose his Senses or Speech, it shall not be lawful for his Presbyters to perform the Episcopal Functions in his Presence, but he shall send for a Bishop, who shall perform these Functions in his Church.* This Canon would have been ridiculous, if the Presbyters us'd to preach for Ordinar, and administer Sacraments, or perform the Episcopal Functions in other Congregations. And a Bishop's being appointed to send for another Bishop in this Case, supposes, That either Bishops dwell near him, in the next Congregations.

the Congregation, according to the quality of their Crime, Adulterers are ordered to appear more frequently than Fornicators. This is conform to the 31 Canon of the same Council of Carthage. *Ut pœnitentibus secundum peccatorum differentiam, Episcopi arbitrio pœnitentiæ tempora decernantur.*

37. By Acts of Assemblies of this Church, these who are guilty of hainous Sins, such as Adultery, are appointed to appear a determin'd number of days before the Congregation; yet if they be not duly humbled, and discover not such signs of Godly Sorrow as are requisite, the Minister or Bishop in whose Parish they are, may lengthen the time, and cause them appear before the Congregation more Days than the Assembly specifies. And thus the Council of Carthage, anno 398 Canon 75, ordains, That Negligents shall be latter received. *Ut negligentiores pœnitentes, tardius recipiantur.*

38. The Minister or Session may also shorten the time of the publick appearance of such Scandalous Persons, according as they find them affected with a sense of their Sin, or discover in them Evidences of Sincerity. Thus the 5th. Canon of the Council of Ancyra impowers the Bishops to shorten or lengthen the time of Penance according to the behaviour of the Penitents. *Statuimus autem ut episcopi modo conversationis examinatio.* (ἐπισκόπος δὲν τρόπον τῆς ἐπιστροφῆς δοκιμάσωνται) *potestatem habeant velutendi clementia, vel plus temporis adjiciendi. Ante omnia autem & præcedens vita, & quæ consecuta est examinetur.* By the by, how could a Bishop do this in a Diocess of the modern Fashion? Can the Bishop of London observe the Conversation of all the disorderly Persons in his Diocess? This Canon manifestly supposeth that the Bishop's Diocess was nothing but one Congregation.

39. These Persons that are notorious and impudent Sinners, our Church uses to cast out at length

length by the Sentence of *Excommunication*. And that this is conform to the Practice of the Ancient Church, is what every Body knows, and is abundantly evident by the Canons already mentioned. And this is a Practice founded not only on Scripture, but the Light of Nature it self: The *Druides* in *France*, who had nothing but common Sense to direct them, used such a practice as *Cæsar* witnesseth in his Commentaries. †

40. Our Church proceeds not rashly to this Sentence, but has recourse thereto as the last remedy, when, after much pains taken upon the Person to convince and bring him to Repentance, and all to no purpose, he is found to be desperate and incorrigible. This is suitable to the Doctrine of *Ambrose*, in his second Book of *Offic. C. 27*. Let a Member that is Rotten be cut off with Grief, saith he, and let it be long handled to try if it can be cured, by Medicaments, if it cannot be cured, then let the good Physician cut it off.

41. Neither does our Church proceed to this Sentence, for every slight Miscarriage, but in case of gross Crimes and obstinate persisting in them, or manifest Rebellion and Contempt of the Churches Authority. According to the second Canon of the 5th. Council of *Orleans*, which forbids Bishops to Excommunicate a Person for small and slight Causes. *Nullus sacerdotum, quenquam rectæ fidei hominem, pro parvis & levibus causis a communione suspendat præter eas culpas pro quibus antiqui Patres a Ecclesia arceri jusserunt, committentes.* The Church of *England* abuses this Sacred Ordinance

† *Si quis aut privatus aut publicus, eorum [Druidum] decreto non fieri sacrificiis interdicunt, hæc pœna apud eos est gravissima, quibus ita est interdictum, ut numero impiorum ac iceleratorum habentur, ut omnes decedunt, aditum eorum sermonemque defugiunt, ne quid ex contagione incommo- accipiant, neque in petentibus jus redditur, neque bonos ullus communicatur.* De Bello Gallic. lib. 6. It seems that when any, whether Public or Private Person, was excommunicated by the *Druides*, or excluded from the Sacrifices, he was in as hard Circumstances, as he would have been, if there had been a Law that his Excheat should fall in that Case.

of Excommunication most abominably, not only by Excommunicating Persons for slight and ridiculous Reasons (thus they will Excommunicate one, if he refuse to pay his Groat to the Officer, which is plainly to mock Christ and the Church) but by robbing the Church or Ecclesiastical Officers of the power of inflicting this Censure, and putting it in the Hands of a Civil Court, contrary to Scripture, to all the Fathers without excepting one, to the Canons of all the Councils Universal, and particular, National or Provincial. Nevertheless they are always Boasting that they have Antiquity on their side, and the unquestionable practice of the Primitive Church. Should they be praised in this? I raise them not.

42. Sentence of Excommunication is not pronounced against any Person in this Church till he be three several times warn'd, that having some space of time to think on his Danger, Tryal may be made, if he will relent. It seems such method was followed in Gregory the Great's time, who says, *2. Ep. 54. That there ought to be three Admonitions before Excommunication.* Du Pin on the 4th. Cent. pag. 84.

43. A Person who is Excommunicated by any Presbytery in this Church, is reckon'd Excommunicated by all the other Presbyteries, so that till the sentence be taken off, he will not be admitted to Communion in any Congregation or Church in his Nation. This answers to the 5th. Canon of the Council of Nice, which ordains, *That none of those who shall be separated from the Church by the Bishops in each Province, can be received or restor'd to communion in any other Place.* And the 5th. Canon of the Council of Saragosa, anno 381, which forbids Bishops under pain of Excommunication to receive those who are Excommunicated by their own Bishops. And the 7th. Canon of the Council of Turin, anno

400, which forbids Bishops to receive those into Communion, who have been Excommunicated in some other Place. *Neque abjectum recipiat in Communionem.*

44. In this Church a Sentence of Excommunication inflicted by a Superior Judicatory, as a Synod or Assembly, cannot be taken by any inferior Judicatory. This is founded on common Sense, and is very conform to the Discipline of the Ancient Church, to all such Canons as allow Appeals from a Bishop and Presbytery to the Bishops of the Provincial Synod; and from the Bishops of the Province to the Bishops of the whole Diocess. If Excommunications inflicted by a Superior, could have been taken off by inferior Judicatories, Appeals might have been made from the Bishops of the Diocess, to the Bishops of a particular Province; or from the Bishops of the Province, to a Bishop or Presbytery, which would have been a procedure altogether ridiculous.

45. Tho the Sentence of Excommunication inflicted by a Presbytery, may be taken off by the Provincial Synod, or Assembly, it cannot be taken off by any other Presbytery in the Kingdom. According to the 16th. Canon of the Council of Arles which ordains that those who are separated from the Communion, shall be restor'd no where else but in the place where they are Excommunicated *De his, qui pro delicto suo a communione separantur ita placuit, ut quibuscunque locis fuerant exclusi, eodem loco Communionem consequantur.*

46. Our General Assembly, in the Year 1638 made an Act which some perhaps will think is very hard, to wit, That *these who will not forbear the Company of Excommunicated Persons, after due Admonition, let them be Excommunicated themselves except they forbear.* But this Act is very conform to the 2d. Canon of the Council of Antioch, which forbid

the holding of Communion with those that are Excommunicated under the Penalty of being Excommunicated themselves. τοῖς ἀκοινώνητοῖς κοινωνῶν, καὶ τῷτον ἀκοινώνητον εἶναι, ὡς ἀν' συγχέοντά τὸν κανόνα τῆς Ἐκκλησίας. And the 15 Can: of the Council of Toledo, anno 400, which ordains, that we shall neither Eat nor Drink, or Converse with a Lay-man or Clergy-man who is Excommunicated, and that these who Converse with such Persons, be Excommunicated themselves. *Si quis cum illo colloqui aut convivari fuerit deprehensus, etiam ipse absteineatur.*

47. When a Person is Excommunicated, the Presbytery is obliged to give notice thereof to the Synod, that the Ministers there may inform all the People belonging to their Churches, that they may carry toward such an one as an Excommunicated Person. In like manner, the Synod is obliged to inform the General Assembly concerning this Excommunicated Person, that all the other Synods may be warned concerning him in like manner. This does not much differ from the 13th. Canon of a Gallican Council held about the Year 615, which appoints *The Bishops when they Excommunicate any, to acquaint the neighbouring Towns and Churches with it.*

48. There is a twofold Excommunication in use in this Church, the greater and lesser Excommunication. It is reasonable to think, that the Sentence which Victor Bishop of Rome pronounced, against the Asiatic Churches, was that of the lesser Excommunication, by which he excluded these Churches from Communicating with the Church of Rome, or renounced Communion with them, prohibiting any Member belonging to the Roman Church to Communicate with these Asiatic Churches: As we think it unlawful for any Member of our Church to Communicate with the Church of England, tho we do not at all deny that the Church of England is a true Church of Christ, and a considerable Member of

the Universal Church; and that there are many good Christians in it, only seeing there are several Corruptions in that Church, and seeing Persons cannot Communicate with that Church without joining in some of these Corruptions, or Countenancing them one way or other, we judge it unlawful to Communicate with her, as long as she adheres to these Corruptions. And I say it is Rational to think that all that Victor intended was such a Non-communicating with the Asiatic Churches as long as they continued in that Error he thought they were in for it cannot be suppos'd, that he and his adherents were so far out of their Wits as to pretend to Unchurch so many Churches, and send them all a packing to the Devil, for such a little Trifle, as Celebrating or not Celebrating Easter on such a particular Day. And probably, it was the Sentence of this lesser Excommunication that the Eminent Bishop *Ambrose* pronounced against the Godly Emperor *Theodosius*, whereby he debar'd him from sealing Ordinances for a time, on account of his great Mischief with respect to the City *Theſſalonica*, which *Sozomen* gives account of, *lib. 7. c. 25.* The greater Excommunication is a casting one quite out of the Church, looking on him as a Heathen and Publican, this *Tertullian* (*lib. de Pudi. c. 4.*) expresses by *Non modo limine, verum omni Ecclesiæ recto submovere.*

49. Simony is condemned by the Acts of our Assembly, such as is condemned in the 16th. Canon of the Council of *Chalon* in the 7th. Century, which declares, that they who gave Money to be made Bishops, Presbyters, or Deacons, shall be deprived of the Dignity that they would have purchased. *Ut nullus Episcopus, neque Presbyter per præmium ad sacrum ordinem penitus accedat. Quod qui fecerit, ipso honore, quem præmiis comparare præsumpserit, omnino privetur.*

50. Agreeable also to the Acts of our Assemblies are the 10th. and 11th. Canon of the 5th. Council of *Orleans* in the 6th. Century, which declare, that

non

none shall attain to a Bishoprick by Money or Solicitation, and that such a Bishop shall not be set over the People whom they would not have, and that those who shall obtain a Bishoprick by Force or Interest, shall be depos'd. *Ut nullum Episcopatum præmiis aut comparatione liceat adipisci, sed cum voluntate Regis juxta electionem Cleri ac Plebis, sicut in antiquis canonibus continetur scriptum, consensu Cleri ac Plebis, a Metropolitano, vel quem vice sua miserit, cum provincialibus Pontifex consecratur. Quod si quis hanc regulam hujus sanctæ constitutionis, per coëmptionem excesserit, eum, qui per præmia ordinatus fuerit, statuimus removendum. Item (sicut antiqui Canones decreverunt) nullus invitis detur Episcopus, sed nec per oppressionem potentium personarum, ad consensum faciendum cives aut Clerici (quod dici nefas est) inclinentur.* And the 22 Canon of the Universal Council Quini-seximum, *Eos qui pecuniis ordinantur, sive Episcopos, sive qualescunque Clericos, & non per examinationem ac vitæ electionem, deponi jubemus, sed & eos etiam qui ordinaverunt.*

51. Our Acts also condemn ordaining a Successor to a Minister as long as he lives. According to the 12 Canon of the 5th. Council of Orleans, *Nulli viventi Episcopo alius superponatur aut superordinateur Episcopus, nisi forsitan in ejus loco, quem Culpa capitalis dejecerit.*

52. The 16 Canon of the Universal Council Quini-seximum, which declares, *That the seven Deacons, Acts 6. were Ministers only of common Tables, and not of Altars* (*ἐυρισκόμεν ὡς ὁ λόγος αὐτοῖς ἐπὶ τῇ τῶν τοῖς μυστηρίοις διακονομένων ἢν ἀνδρῶν, ἀλλὰ ἐπὶ τῇ τῶν ταῖς χρείαις τῇ τραπέζων ὑπεργίας.*) and which rejects the Canon of the Council of Neocaesarea, which by Misunderstanding that place of Scripture, ordain'd, *That there should be seven Deacons in every Church,* is agreeable to the Sense and principles of our Church.

53. Our Assemblies have also made such an Act as that which you have in one of the Capitularies of Charlemagne, viz. *That the Bishops should know the Canons.*

I hope I may now say, it is evident, that that which we call *Presbyterian Government* in Scotland, is not such a *Novelty* as ignorant Persons imagine, and Self-seekers among us pretend; and that the *Presbyterian Discipline*, is the Ancient Discipline of the Church. And I conclude that this Government of the Church of Scotland, by Presbyteries, Synods, General Assemblies, and Commissions of General Assemblies, is really & properly Episcopal Government as the Government of the Church was Episcopal in the third and fourth Centuries: And that the Government of the Church of England is not Episcopal but Presbyterian, the Prelates there being really nothing but Presbyters who have usurped a Power over the true Bishops of England, overturned the Episcopal Government, and destroy'd or suppress'd all these Ecclesiastical Courts, Presbyteries, Provincial Synods, General Councils, or National Assemblies, of which such frequent mention in the 2, 3, 4, or 5. Centuries.

C H A P. IX.

The Power of the People in Electing their Bishops or Pastors Asserted and Vindicated.

J. S. pretends; that in the Days of Cyprian, the Bishops were elected, not by the Suffrages of the People, but of the Neighbouring Bishops, or the

he Bishops of the Province. If this was, did not *Optatus* express himself very obscurely, or rather unintelligibly and ridiculously in the before mentioned Sentence, *Tunc suffragio totius Populi Cæcilianus eligitur, & manus imponente Felice, Episcopus ordinatur*, or when he said that *Cæcilian* was Elected by the Suffrages of all the People, when his meaning was, that *Cæcilian* was Elected by the Suffrages of the Bishops of the Province? If the Bishops were Elected by *J. S.* fancies, *Optatus* would have said, that *Cæcilian* was Elected by the Suffrages of the Bishops of the Province, and ordain'd by the same Bishops. The rare Gloss then that *J. S.* puts on *Suffragium Populi* (viz. That it implyeth no more but their *Approbation* or *Good liking*) is wholly Unserviceable to him here. For seeing the People approved the Ordination of *Cæcilian* as much as his Election, there was no reason that *Optatus* should say, that he was Elected by the Suffrages of the People, rather than that he was Ordain'd by the Suffrages of the People. I ask at *J. S.* then, Why did *Optatus* say the one rather than the other? And seeing the People did approve *Cæcilian's* Election and Ordination equally, I desire *J. S.* may do us the favour to inform us, why *Optatus* did not say both? to wit, that *Cæcilian* was Elected by the Suffrages of the People, and ordain'd by the Suffrages of the People.

The 3 Council of Rome under Pope *Sylvester*, decreeth thus, Let the Bishop to be ordain'd, be chosen by all the Church, not one of the Members of the Church being wanting, but all of them meeting together, &c. *Et si ad honorem Presbyterii accedat, & faciens in eo ordine annos sex, si fuerit omnium viva gratia, non præmio, non invasione Cupiditatis, nulli rari piens gradum, sic ab omni Ecclesia eligatur consecrandus Episcopus, nullo de membris Ecclesiæ intercurrente, & omni Ecclesia conveniente. Et dixerunt Episcopi; placet. Ut nulli Episcopo liceat sine cuncta Ecclesia,*

*Ecclesia, a novissimo Gradu usque ad primum ordinare Neophytum: Et dixerunt Episcopi, placet. Sylvester Episcopus dixit: A nobis incipientes moderamini lenitatis indicare commonemus, ut nulli Episcopo liceat quemlibet gradum clerici ordinare aut consecrare, nisi cum omni adunata Ecclesia, si placet? Et dixerunt Episcopi, placet. † And the Council of Clermont anno 535, declares, That Persons ought to be advanced to the high Dignity of the Ministry, not by the favour of some few, but by the Suffrages of all, * that he who is a Bishop must be chosen by the Clergy and People and ordain'd by the Metropolitan, or with his Consent That it is unlawful to use the Interest of Grandees, Craft Promises, Presents and Threatnings, and that those who use such ways, shall be deprived of the Communion of the Church, whereof they should be Bishops; Omnium*

con-

† It may be observed here, that the Gloss which Dr. Maurice puts on *omnis Fraternitas, Plebe universa*, and such Expressions in Cyprian's Epistles which we have considered before, Page 33, 34. quadrates very ill with the words of this Council. The words of this Council demonstrate evidently that *tota Ecclesia, Plebe universa*, and the like, must not be understood in such a limited sense, as the Doctor would make us believe they should be taken in, but in the very fullest Sense. *Nullo de membris Ecclesie intercedente sed omni Ecclesia conveniente.* In a word, the words of this Council can no more admit Dr. Maurice's Gloss, than the words we have cited out of Optatus in the beginning of this Chapter, can bear the Gloss which F. S puts on *Suffragium Populi.*

* Hence it is evident, that Persons are constituted or made Bishops by the Election of the People, and not by Ordination, which is performed by the Bishops. One is made or constituted a Bishop by that by which he is advanced to the high Dignity of the Ministry, but according to this Council, the Suffrage of the People is the thing, and not Ordination that advances one to the high Dignity of the Ministry, therefore the Suffrage of the People is the thing that creates or makes one a Bishop. This is also evident from the 22d Canon of the Council of Constantinople here cited, for in it the Election and Promotion of a Bishop are one thing; wherefore they who elect a Bishop, make a Bishop, if the Clergy elect one to the Episcopal Office, they make the Bishop; and if the People elect to the Episcopal Office, the People make the Bishop. And seeing Mr. Dodwel's Book on Schism is built upon the Supposition, that the Episcopal or Ministerial Power is conveyed by Ordination from Bishops to Bishops in an uninterrupted Line of Succession from the Apostles; and seeing this Supposition is notoriously false, and a most senseless Fiction, the Episcopal Power being conveyed to each Bishop from the People by their Election, it follows necessarily, that Mr. Dodwel's Book is like a House without a Foundation that is, it is nothing at all, nothing but a heap of Sophismes and idle and impertinent Notions. Thus Cyprian says in his 43. Epist: *ad Plebem universam, Quod Sacerdoti, quem tanto amore & ardore fecistis, nec dum, vo salutare, & nec dum complexibus vestris inherere contingat.* Cyprian acknowledges, that the People made him a Bishop by their suffrages.

constendat Electione, non paucorum favore. And the 3^d Council of Orleans Canon 3^d. Reserves the Ordination of Metropolitans to a Metropolitan in the presence of the Bishops of the Province, and requires that he be chosen by the Bishop of the Province with the Consent of the Clergy and People of the City, it being fit, that he who is to preside over all, should have the Suffrages of all these over whom he is to preside. And as to the Bishops of the Province, it ordains, that they shall be ordain'd by the Metropolitan, and chosen by the Clergy and the People. *De compvincialibus (vel Episcopis) ordinandis, cum consensu Metropolitanis, Cleri & Civium, juxta priorum Canonum statuta, voluntas & electio requiratur.* This *Voluntas & Electio*, is quite another thing than such *Approbation* or *Good-liking* as is without Power, or which is nothing but meer *Testimony*.

One would think that these Canons differ, as much as the East is distant from the West, from the 22^d Canon of the Council of Constantinople, in the 9th. Century, anno 869, reckon'd by the Latines the 8th. General Council, but by the Greeks a Combination of Robbers, which runs in these Terms, *Let no lay Person, whether they be Princes or Men of Power, meddle in the Election or Promotion of any Bishop whatsoever, seeing that it is not convenient, that either they who are in Power, or other Laick Persons whatsoever have any Power in this matter, it rather becoming them to be silent, and patiently to attend till such time as the Election of the Bishop that is to be chosen, be finish'd regularly by the College of the Clergy-men.* *Cum nullam in talibus potestatem quenuquam potestativorum vel caterorum Laicorum habere conveniat, sed potius silere, ac attendere sibi, usque quo regulariter Collegio Eccles. suscipiat finem electio futuri Pontificis.* But according to *J. S's* Sense of Things, this Canon agrees with the preceeding most exactly, nothing of Elective Voice or Suffrage is allowed to the People by this Canon, as is very plain, and according to *J. S.* as little of an Elective Voice is

allowed to them in the preceeding Canons, tho in them it is declar'd expresly and positively, that the Bishops shall be chosen by the People. They are no ordinary Persons, you must think, who can find out a way to reconcile such Differences, and cause such opposite Points of the Compass to meet. Let us see how they pretend to work such Miracles, and what *J. S.* has to say against the People's Suffrages or Elective Voice in the promotion of their Bishops, and by what means he pretends to elude the clear Testimony of *Cyprian* as to this particular.

In the first place, tho *Cyprian* positively declares that *Cornelius* was made Bishop by the Suffrages of the People then present, *J. S.* can positively deny that the People had any thing like an Elective Voice in the Affair. Why? All that the Clergy did, says he, toward his promotion, was to give him *Good Testimony* (*De clericorum pene omnium Testimonio, de Plebis, quatum affuit Suffragio, says Cyprian.*) And says *J. S.* can we think that the People could do more? This *can we think* is Demonstration no doubt. Can we think that the People of *Rome* could do more than the Senate in the Election of a Consul? Yes indeed we can think so very well, and that they who think otherwise think not right. And *Cyprian* says else where, that *Cornelius* was made Bishop, *de Cleri & Plebis Suffragio*, which gives us to understand says *J. S.* that *Suffrage* and *Testimony* are one thing, and therefore *Suffrage* signifieth no more than *Testimony*. And, say I, if *Suffrage* and *Testimony* are one thing in *Cyprian*, then *Testimony* signifies *Suffrage* or Elective Voice; So that *Cornelius* was chosen or made Bishop by the Elective Voice of the Clergy and People of the *Roman Church*.

As to *Cyprian*, it is said, that he was made Bishop *Judicio Dei*, by the Judgment of God. And hence *J. S.* infers, he was not made Bishop by the Suffrages of the People. But no doubt *J. S.* knows as well as I can tell him, that the Call of God to an Office

Is twofold, Mediate and Immediate. The *Mediate* is, when God calls one, for Example, to the Episcopal Office, in an ordinary way, by the Intervention of Men, or the Ministry of these to whom he has given the Right of Elections in the Church. The *Immediate* is, when God calls one to an Office in an extraordinary way, without the Intervention of Men, as *Paul* was call'd to the Apostolate. If *Cyprian* was made Bishop by God the first way, *J. S.*'s. Inference is very impertinent, for *Mediate* Calls are so far from excluding the Suffrages of the People, that on the contrary they suppose them; God makes a Man Bishop in a *Mediate* way, by the Suffrages of the People, the Call of the People to the Episcopal Office, is the Call of God. Thus *Ambro.* Lib. 10. Ep. 82. *Merito vir tantus evasit quem omnis elegit Ecclesia, merito Creditum quod Divino esset electus iudicio, quem omnes postulavissent.* He then who is Elected to the Episcopal Office by the whole Church, or Suffrages of the People, is Elected or made Bishop *Judicio Dei*, according to *Ambrose*. As to the *Immediate* Call, it does indeed, in some Sense, exclude the Suffrages of the People, but I can't say that it is altogether inconsistent therewith. I grant to *J. S.* that if God should now interpose in an *Immediate* way, and choose one Bishop to a particular Diocess, it could not be referred to the Vote of the People, whether they should have that Person to be their Bishop or not? But it would be no ways absurd if the People of that Diocess should meet and say, *Jesus Christ* has appointed such a Person to be our Bishop, come therefore let us make Him our Bishop by our Suffrages. Thus *Saul* was made King of *Israel* in an *Immediate* way by the Election of God, as *J. S.* will say, yet he was made King by the People at *Gilgal*, And all the People went to *Gilgal*, and there they made *Saul* King before the Lord in *Gilgal*.

1 Sam.

11. 15.

Neither would the Freedom of the People's Election be taken away in this Case; I acknowledge, that if the King or Parliament should Interpose or Name the Person, the Freedom of the People's choice would be taken away thereby, but if God should Name the Person, the Freedom of their Election would not thereby be taken away, because the Freedom of Election lyes in a Liberty to choose the fittest Person, or him whom Christ would have to be Elected. Wherefore *Cyprian* and his Collegues would not have been such *Dunces* as *J. S.* fancies, tho they had thought that *Eleazar* was Elected by the popular Voices, notwithstanding his *Immediate* Call: And tho he had proven that *Cyprian's* Call was *Immediate*, his Gain would not have been so great as he imagines. However, Bishop *Cyprian* was not Elected in an *Immediate* way, or his Call to the Episcopal Office was not *Immediate* but *Mediate* and therefore there can be no shadow of a Pretence for excluding the Suffrages of the People in the Case of his Election. Now that *Cyprian's* Call was not *Immediate* but *Mediate*, is evident.

1. It cannot be pretended that *Cyprian's* Call (or *Cornelius's* either) was *Immediate*, because he was said to be made Bishop *Judicio Dei* by the Judgment of God, as is more than evident by what has been said. Moreover, when the Heathen Magistrates were duly Elected by the Suffrages of the People, they were said to be made such Magistrates by God. And how much more might this have been said of a Christian Bishop, Elected according to the Mind of God, by the Suffrages of his Church, in which he himself has placed the Power of Elections to Ecclesiastical Offices? *J. S.* will not deny that *Lewis* is King of *France* by the *Grace of God*, which is as much as *Judicio Dei*, will he therefore say, that *Lewis* was call'd in an *Immediate* way as *Moses* or *David*?

2. *Pontius* tells us exprefly, that *Cyprian* was made Bifhop by the favour of the People (*Favore Plebis.*) This is not the way of fpeaking when a Perfon is call'd by God in an *Immediate* way. Who ever faid that *Paul* was made an *Apoftle* by the favour of the People? He denies it himfelf, *ἐκ ἀπ' ἀνθρώπων, ὃ δὲ δι' ἀνθρώπου*, fays he. But becaufe *Pontius* fays, *Cyprian* was made Bifhop by the favour of the People, *J. S.* infers, therefore he was not made Bifhop by their formal and ftated Vote. A fine Inference truly! *Plutarch* fays, that *Pompey* procured the Confulfhip for *Lepidus*, having reconcil'd him to the favour of the People, *Lepidus* was made Conful then by the favour of the People, fhould it therefore be inferr'd, that he was not made Conful by their formal and ftated Vote? One would be thought ridiculous if he fhould make fuch an inference. There is no Inconfiftency then between *Favour* and *Vote*; fo that one's being chofen by the Favour of the People, did not at all hinder his being chofen by the Vote or Suffrages of the People. Certainly the People favour him whom they Eleét to an Office by their Suffrages. And therefore Favour is fometimes put for, or made to fignify Suffrage or Elective Voice. Thus *Lucan* fays, *lib. 1.* That the *Roman* People did fell their *Favour*, that is, did fell their *Votes* or *Suffrages*.

*Hinc rapti Fasces pretio Seftorque Favoris
Ipfe fui Populus, lethalisque ambitus Urbi
Annua Venali rejertens Certamina Campo.*

Moreover, *Cyprian* himfelf fays, That he was made Bifhop by the *Suffrages* of the People. Wherefore, when *Pontius* faid that *Cyprian* was made Bifhop by the *Favour* of the People, his meaning was, that he was made Bifhop by the *Elective Voices* of the People.

3. *Cyprian* himself determines this Point, telling us what to understand by Judgment of God, in *Epist.* 59, where he says, *Nisi ita est perditæ mentis, ut putes sine Dei Judicio fieri sacerdotem, cum Dominus in Evangelio dicat, nonne duo passeret assere veneunt? & neuter eorum cadit in terram sine Patris Voluntate: Cum ille nec minima fieri sine voluntate Dei dicat, existimat aliquis summa & magna, aut non sciente aut non permitte Deo, in Ecclesia Dei fieri; & sacerdotes, id est, Dispensatores ejus non de ejus sententia ordinari? Hoc est fidem non habere, hoc est Deo honorem non dare, cujus nutu & arbitrio regi & gubernari omnia scimus & credimus. Plane Episcopi non de voluntate Dei fiunt, qui extra Ecclesiam Dei fiunt, sed contra dispositionem & traditionem Evangelii.* This is plain Language, an evident Demonstration that *Cyprian* never dream'd he had an Immediate Call. According to this it may be said of any Officer whether Civil or Ecclesiastical, who is Elected duly and according to Law, that he is made such an Officer *Judicio Dei*, by the Judgment of God *. It cannot be pretended then, that *Cyprian* or *Cornelius* had an Immediate Call, or such a Call from God as excluded the Suffrages or Elective Voices of the People, on the contrary, the Call they had from God, was by the Elective Voices of the People.

In the next place, *J. S.* says, That the Sentence *Quando Plebs ipsa maxime habeat potestatem vel eligendi dignos sacerdotes vel indignos recusandi*, that is, seing the People themselves especially have the Power either of Electing worthy Bishops, or rejecting the Unworthy, has nothing to do with choosing Bishops by popular Votes when a Chair is Vacant. But this is a Misrepresentation. If this Sentence has

* *Illustrissimus Annalista (Cardinal: Baronius) Divino aliquo signo designatum (Cornelium) putat. Sed horum non est miracula credere. Ille Dei Judicio electus dicitur, qui talis erit, qualem lex Divina ad id munus obveniens exigit,* says the learned Bishop of Oxford, in *Annal: in Epist: Cypri.* 55.

has no relation to the Electing a Bishop when a Chair is Vacant, pray what is the meaning of thir Words which go before? *Quæ ante Oculos habentes, & solícite ac religiose Considerantes, in Ordinationibus sacerdotum, non nisi immaculatos & integros Antistites eligere debemus.* Is not this to speak of the Election of a Bishop to a vacant Church? But F. S. conceals this from his Reader, and then tells him, *What can be plainer than that this passage has nothing to do with choosing Bishops by popular Votes when a Chair is Vacant?* Plain no doubt to these who are for taking his word for it, or have a strong Propensity to believe any thing that makes for *Romish* Episcopacy, be it true or false.

In a word, says F. S. nothing plainer than that all aim'd at, to wit by the foresaid Sentence, is, That the People have an inherent right to separate from Bishops when their Communions are so polluted, that they cannot be continued in without the manifest hazard of their Souls who continue in them.

It is good that F. S. has made this Concession, *That the People have an inherent right to separate from the Bishops when their Communions are so polluted that they cannot be continued in, &c.* He has done two things hereby, 1. He has ruined his own Cause. 2. He has destroy'd his Friend M. Dodwell's Book, Entitled, *Separation of Churches from Episcopal Government proved to be Schismatical, &c.*

1. He has ruined his own Cause hereby. It will be no difficult thing to prove from this Concession, that the People have the Right of Elections, or Power to Choose a Bishop when their Chair is Vacant. If the People have an inherent Right to separate from the Communion of their own Bishop, when it is so Polluted that it cannot be continued in without Danger, they have also an inherent Right to choose that Neighbouring Bishop they shall join with or not join with, until they get a Bishop of their own

own whom they may Communicate with safely, according to the Council of *Agathar* Can: 3 in the year 506 which ordains, That if the Bishops Excommunicate any innocent Persons, or these whose Faults are slight, &c. these Persons may Communicate with other Bishops until such time as a Council do meet *Communio illis usque ad tempus Synodi, a reliquis Episcopis non denegetur*, and if they have a Power to do this, they have also a Power to choose a Bishop for themselves when their Chair is Vacant, there is every whit as much Reason for the one as for the other. But,

2. The principal thing for which I take notice of this Concession, is, That *J. S.* has thereby destroy'd that Book of *M. Dodwell's* we have mention'd. For *First*, If the People have an inherent Right to separate from the Bishops, when their Communion is so polluted that it cannot be continued without hazard, then the People had an inherent Right to separate from the Bishops at the Reformation, because the Communion of the Bishops then was Idolatrous, and consequently so polluted that it could not be continued in without manifest hazard. And,

Secondly, If the People had a Right to separate from the Communion of the Bishops, then they had also an inherent Right to set up another Communion distinct from the polluted and hazardous Communion of these Bishops, or to set up new Assemblies. And this is evident, because what ever Right they had to do the one, the very same Right they had to do the other; their Souls would have been in hazard if they had continued in the polluted Communion of these Idolatrous Bishops, and this gave them a Right to separate from them; In like manner, their Souls would have been in hazard if they had lived separately, and had not set up new Communion, or Assemblies, thro' want of Sacraments and other means of Grace, or of access to worship

God in a publick way, wherefore to set up new Assemblies or new Communion, was incumbent on them as a necessary Duty, and there is no Right more Authentick than that which is founded on indispensable Necessity, in that Case God has not only given People a Right to do the thing, but has laid an Obligation upon them to do it.

They had a Right before they separated to meet in the Christian Assemblies with the rest of the Members of the *Roman Church* in *Europe*, who adher'd to the Pope, and continued in his Communion, this no body questions; and say I, whatever Right they had to meet in the Christian Assemblies before their Separation from the Church of *Rome*, the same Right they had to set up new Assemblies or Communion after their Separation from the Church of *Rome*; or they had as full Right to set up new Assemblies after they separated, as those who remain'd in the Communion of the Pope, had to keep up the old Assemblies: And this is evident, because the Right they had before their Separation to meet in Christian Assemblies, they did not lose after their Separation: And this is evident, because they could not lose that Right but one of these two ways, either by Separation it self from the Church of *Rome*, or by their losing that which gave them a Right to meet in the Christian Assemblies before their Separation: Not the first, because they had an inherent Right to separate from the *Romish* Assemblies, or Communion of the *Popish* Bishops, as being Idolatrous and Hazardous: Not the second either, because that which gave them a Right to meet in the Assemblies before their Separation, was their Christianity, but their Christianity they did not lose after their Separation from the Church of *Rome*, or by separating from it, but on the contrary perfected it, purified it from manifold Corruptions,

could not subsist as Churches without them, *without these*, says *Ignatus* to the *Trall*: *a Church is not call'd*, or *There is no Church*, Ecclesiastical Societies or Churches can no more subsist without Bishops and Prsbyters, than Civil Societies or Common-wealths can without Magistrates or Rulers. After they separated from the Churches of *Rome* then, Bishops and Presbyters they were necessitated to have. Wherefore one of two must be said, either that Christ gave them a Right to Create Bishops and Presbyters to themselves, or obliged them to have recourse to the Popish Bishops or Church of *Rome* for them. And it cannot be said that Christ would oblige them to go to the Church of *Rome* for them, to suppose that, is, 1. Ridiculous. And that because the Church of *Rome* would create no Bishops to them after their Separation, the Popish Clergy would rather Excommunicate them, and condemn them to Fire and Faggot, than Constitute Bishops and Presbyters to them. Christ would have put his Churches to great Hardships if he had obliged them either to want Bishops and Presbyters altogether, or to have Recourse to their Mortal Enemies for them. 2. Monstrous. Monstrous it is to suppose that Christ would give a Right to the Synagogue of Satan to Create Bishops and Presbyters, but no Right at all to his own Churches to do it, that he would invest a Company of Idolaters, Apostates, and impious Wretches who regarded nothing but their secular Intérest, with the Right of Creating Bishops and Presbyters to govern his Church, that the Church should have no Ecclesiastical Power, no Power of Constituting Officers, of Administring Sacraments, of Discipline or the like, but what is derived from Antichrist and his Drudges. 3. When the European Nations broke off from the *Roman* Empire, and Erected themselves into distinct Monarchies or Common Wealths, no body doubts that after their Disjunction

junction they had a full Right and Power to Create Kings or other Magistrates to themselves; and if it should be said, that these Nations had no Right at all to Create Magistrates, that the Kings which they made after their Disjunction were but Usurpers, had no Right to Act as Kings, and that every thing they did as such was null and void, because they received not *Ordination* from the *Roman* Emperor or Senat, that would be justly reckon'd a very senseless Notion. But apply this to the Church, and immediately it becomes strong Sense, the most Rational thing in the World, and there are some among us who can prove it to a Demonstration. When the Protestants brake off from the Church of *Rome*, and Erected themselves into new Churches, the Bishops and Presbyters which they Constituted, were not lawful, the Sacraments Administred by them, and all they did as Bishops is Null and Void, and that because they received not Ordination from the Popish Bishops, from whom they were Disjoined; and let their Popish Bishops be Antichristian, Monsters of Wickedness, Devils, or what you will, no Ordination is Valid but what comes thro' their Hands, God will call no Person to the Episcopal Office, but whom they approve or ordain. Is it possible that People believe what they say, when they affirm such things? After the European Kingdoms were disjoin'd from *Rome*, and set up by themselves, they were no more concerned with it, wherefore no body is so senseless as to imagine that they were obliged to go to *Rome* still, to get their Kings Created or Magistrates Constituted, this would be to suppose, that they were still in Subjection to *Rome*, after they were disjoined from it. And as little were the Protestant Churches concerned with the Pope or Popish Bishops after their Separation, wherefore it is contrary to common Sense to think that the Bishops and Presbyters which they set up after the Reformation,

could not subsist as Churches without them, *without these*, says Ignatius to the *Trall*: *a Church is not call'd*, or *There is no Church*, Ecclesiastical Societies or Churches can no more subsist without Bishops and Prsbyters, than Civil Societies or Common-wealths can without Magistrates or Rulers. After they separated from the Churches of *Rome* then, Bishops and Presbyters they were necessitated to have. Wherefore one of two must be said, either that Christ gave them a Right to Create Bishops and Presbyters to themselves, or obliged them to have recourse to the Popish Bishops or Church of *Rome* for them. And it cannot be said that Christ would oblige them to go to the Church of *Rome* for them, to suppose that, is, 1. Ridiculous. And that because the Church of *Rome* would create no Bishops to them after their Separation, the Popish Clergy would rather Excommunicate them, and condemn them to Fire and Faggot, than Constitute Bishops and Presbyters to them. Christ would have put his Churches to great Hardships if he had obliged them either to want Bishops and Presbyters altogether, or to have Recourse to their Mortal Enemies for them. 2. Monstrous. Monstrous it is to suppose that Christ would give a Right to the Synagogue of Satan to Create Bishops and Presbyters, but no Right at all to his own Churches to do it, that he would invest a Company of Idolaters, Apostates, and impious Wretches who regarded nothing but their secular Interest, with the Right of Creating Bishops and Presbyters to govern his Church, that the Church should have no Ecclesiastical Power, no Power of Constituting Officers, of Administring Sacraments, of Discipline or the like, but what is derived from Antichrist and his Drudges. 3. When the European Nations broke off from the *Roman* Empire, and Erected themselves into distinct Monarchies or Common Wealths, no body doubts that after their Dis-

junction

junction they had a full Right and Power to Create Kings or other Magistrates to themselves; and if it should be said, that these Nations had no Right at all to Create Magistrates, that the Kings which they made after their Disjunction were but Usurpers, had no Right to Act as Kings, and that every thing they did as such was null and void, because they received not *Ordination* from the *Roman* Emperor or Senat, that would be justly reckon'd a very senseless Notion. But apply this to the Church, and immediately it becomes strong Sense, the most Rational thing in the World, and there are some among us who can prove it to a Demonstration. When the Protestants brake off from the Church of *Rome*, and Erected themselves into new Churches, the Bishops and Presbyters which they Constituted, were not lawful, the Sacraments Administred by them, and all they did as Bishops is Null and Void, and that because they received not Ordination from the Popish Bishops, from whom they were Disjoined; and let their Popish Bishops be Antichristian, Monsters of Wickedness, Devils, or what you will, no Ordination is Valid but what comes thro' their Hands, God will call no Person to the Episcopal Office, but whom they approve or ordain. Is it possible that People believe what they say, when they affirm such things? After the European Kingdoms were disjoin'd from *Rome*, and set up by themselves, they were no more concerned with it, wherefore no body is so senseless as to imagine that they were obliged to go to *Rome* still, to get their Kings Created or Magistrates Constituted, this would be to suppose, that they were still in Subjection to *Rome*, after they were disjoined from it. And as little were the Protestant Churches concerned with the Pope or Popish Bishops after their Separation, wherefore it is contrary to common Sense to think that the Bishops and Presbyters which they set up after the Reformation,

were not true Bishops and Presbyters unless they received Ordination from the Popish Bishop. To suppose that they were obliged to go to the *Roman* Bishops that they might constitute Bishops to them, it is to suppose that they were still subject to these *Roman* Bishops after they were disjoin'd, and had renounced Communion with them. 4. It is Blasphemy and a Reflection upon the Wisdom of God Almighty to say that God gave them no Right to constitute Bishops & Presbyters to themselves when they separated from the Popish Bishops. For according to this Supposition, he gave them an inherent Right, or rather laid it on them as a Duty to separate from the Idolatrous Popish Communion, and to erect distinct Churches to no Purpose at all, and to bring them into as great or greater Difficulties than they would have been in if they had continued in the Idolatrous Popish Communion and made no Separation from *Rome*. For if they had continued in the Popish Communion, it would indeed have been impossible to them, or at least very difficult to carry on their Salvation work, because the means of Salvation in that Communion were so polluted and corrupted, that they were useless in a manner, and improper in order to the attaining of the End; but after they separated and set up new Churches, their Salvation was yet more unpracticable thro' a total want of the means of Grace and Salvation, want of the Preaching of the Gospel, which is the Food of the Soul, and Nourishment of the Spiritual Life, and of the Sacraments, which in the Opinion of M. *Dodwell* and his Disciples are of absolute Necessity: And that they could have none of these after their Separation and Erection into new Churches, is evident, because they could have no Bishops and Presbyters, God gave them no Right to constitute them, and if they could not constitute them themselves, there was no possibility of getting them any where else. It must

must be said then, that when the People separated from the Church of *Rome* at the Reformation, they had an inherent Right to Create Bishops and Presbyters to themselves, tho not one ordain'd Person had joined with them then.

To Illustrate this Point a little, I say, that God by giving a Natural Life to Men, has thereby given them an inherent Right to guard against any thing that might destroy it, and to use all proper means to preserve it, and make it comfortable in this World, he has given them a Right not to Eat Poison, or walk over Precipices, a Right to build Houses, set up Manufactories, and to cause prepare Food and Raiment for themselves, &c. and this is a Right that they cannot lose, as long as they have a Life, by Prescription or any other way. In like manner, say a *Fortiori* (in regard that the Spiritual Life is more Excellent than the Natural, and intitleth more to Privileges) Christ by giving a Spiritual Life to Believers, has given them an inherent Right to guard against every thing that is naturally Destructive of it, and to use all means that are proper to preserve it, or increase their Graces, and consequently has given them an inherent Right to separate from the Communions of Bishops when polluted; and may prove Destructive to their Spiritual Life, and to set up new Communions, and new Bishops and Presbyters to themselves, seeing these are proper means, and means appointed by God to preserve their Spiritual Life, or increase their Graces, and this is a Right which they cannot lose by Prescription, and can no more alienate, than they can alienate their Souls, or renounce Christ and the Gospel. And therefore they who cannot understand that Right the People in the time of the Reformation had to separate from the *Roman* Bishops (or the Dissenters have to separate from the *English* Bishops, supposing that their Communion is polluted, and can-

cannot be continued in without hazard) or, what Right they had to set up a new Communion, and new Bishops and Presbyters to themselves, or how they come to have true Sacraments, &c. are as senseless and Stupid as they who cannot understand what Right the People in *France* or *Holland* have to abstain from Poison, or to build Houses and Cities, set up Trades and Manufactories, or to cause Food and Raiment be prepar'd for themselves, &c.

Seing then, the People at the Reformation had an inherent Right to separate from the polluted and hazardous Communions of the Popish Bishops and Clergy, to set up pure Communions, and to make new Bishops and Presbyters to keep up these Communions, farewell to the *Line of Succession*; the Conveyance of the Episcopal Power, and a Right to Administer the Sacraments by Ordination in an uninterrupted Line of Succession from the Apostles is an idle and impertinent Fiction; the Protestant Churches at the Reformation, had true Bishops and Presbyters, and consequently true Sacraments, independently on *Romish* Ordination, and would have had; tho they had not had one Bishop or Presbyter among them that received Ordination in the *Romish* Church, or any where else. Wherefore M. *Dodwell's* Book we are speaking of, being wholly built on this false Supposition, to wit, Where there is no true Church, there is no Salvation; and where there are no true Sacraments, there is no true Church; and where there are no true Bishops, there are no true Sacraments; and where there is not Ordination of Bishops in an uninterrupted Line of Succession from the Apostles, there are no true Bishops cometh to nothing. Saith M. *Claude*, this way of arguing is Sophistical, Vain, Deceitful and Illusory to which we oppose this Reasoning, where there are true Believers, there is a true Church; And where there is a True Church, there is a True Ministry, or True Bishops; And where there

ere is a true Ministry, there are true Sacraments,
 c. Neither has M. *Dodwell* proved that the Dis-
 senters are Schismatics, because they have separat-
 ed from the Communion of the *English* Bishops; for
 the People have such an inherent Right as
 J. S. grants they have, proving the Dissenters to be
 Schismatics, or not Schismatics, depends upon the
 discussing of this Point, to wit, *Whether or not the*
Communion of the English Bishops is so polluted that it
cannot be continued in without manifest Hazard?
 Wherefore M. *Dodwell's* pretending to prove them
 to be Schismatics, without entering upon the dis-
 cussing of this Point, and independently on proving
 that the things on the account of which they sepa-
 rate from the said Bishops are un sinful, is altogether
 ridiculous: If the Communion of these Bishops is
 polluted, or if they require Terms of Communion
 that are sinful, so far are the Dissenters from being
 Schismatics, that they have done nothing but what
 they have an inherent Right to do, nothing but
 what they were obliged to do; so that if they
 had done otherwise, they would have been guilty of
 rebellion against *Jesus Christ*. But J. S. must
 show, that we do not reckon our selves much obliged
 to him for destroying that Book of M. *Dodwell's*,
 which was done before to purpose by Writings,
 published long ago, and which are well known in the
 world, particularly, M. *Claude's Defence of the Re-*
formation, and M. *Pajon's Answer to the Book Entit-*
led, Just Prejudices against the Calvinists, which two
 books will make M. *Dodwell's* Treatise eternally In-
 nocuous & ridiculous. To return again to our purpose,
 The Sentence in debate, to wit, *Quando Plebs*
a maxime habeat potestatem vel eligendi dignos sacer-
otes, &c. is in the 67 among the *Cyprianic Epistles*,
 which was writ upon this occasion. *Basilides* a Spa-
 nish Bishop being guilty of great Crimes, demitted
 voluntarily, and another, *Sabinus* was actually Substi-
 tuted

tured in his room ; *Basilides* beginning afterward to Rue that he had parted with his Bishoprick so easily prevailed with the Bishop of *Rome* to interpose that he might be repon'd, this brought the People of the Diocels into a great Perplexity, and obliged them to Write to *Africa* for Advice how to behave in this Affair, to wit, whether they should adhere to their present Bishop *Sabinus* or re-admit *Basilides* who had forfeited his Title by Misbehaving so grossly, if they should be urged so to do by the Bishops of the Province, thro' the Instigation of the Bishop of *Rome*, who had already given to *Basilides* the Right hand of Fellowship.

Whereupon the *African* Bishops send to the People of that Diocels a synodical Epistle, which is this 6th we are speaking of, and therein they advise them to adhere to *Sabinus*, as being a Holy and worthy Person, and lawfully Constituted their Bishop, according to the Prescript of the Gospel and Practice of the Universal Church, and by no means to admit of *Basilides*. And this their Advice they found on Scripture, which holds forth that Bishop should be blameless, and of an untainted Life. That they represent the Danger these People are in who join with prophane Bishops, that by partaking with them in their Sacrifices, they become Guilty of their Crimes, and will be made to share with them in their Punishments: And that therefore the People who are trysted with such Bishops should separate from them, and have nothing to do with the Oblations: thereby insinuating to this People, that they would be altogether inexcuseable if they should receive *Basilides* after they were fairly shut of him. If it would be their Duty to separate from him, he were actually in their Chair, they needed not question that it was their Duty to hinder him to re-enter into it. And that the People have a Right to separate from Scandalous and Prophane Bishops

(and consequently that they had a Right to keep still *Sabinus*, and to hinder *Basilides's* Re-admission) they prove from the Consideration, that the power of Election is lodged in the People, *Quando*, say they, *Plebs ipsa maxime habeat potestatem vel dignos sacerdotes eligendi, vel indignos recujandi*. And hereby they answer the Objection this People did or might make, to wit, That the Bishops of the Province would readily urge *Basilides* upon them, and press them to receive him, seing the Bishop of *Rome*, whose Opinion had great weight, was for his Reception; giving them to understand, that neither the Bishops of the Province, nor any other had a Power to impose upon them in that Affair, seing the People themselves have the power either of Electing good Bishops or receiving bad ones, insinuating, that if *Basilides* were Re-possess of their Episcopal Chair, they would be in the fault principally themselves, seing by Divine Right they had the power of Elections in their own hand; *Quod & ipsum videmus de divina Autoritate descendere*, say they. And that it is indeed of Divine Right, that the People have the Power of Elections, or choosing Bishops to themselves, they prove by three Scripture Precedents, that of *Eleazar* who was constituted High Priest in the face of the Congregation; of *Matthias* and *Barsabas* who were Electd by the People; and of the seven Deacons who were chosen the same way. In a word, thir *African* Fathers signity to the People, that they needed not be difficulted with that Affair, seing it was in their own Power to determine which of the two Pretenders should henceforth fill their Episcopal Chair, that it was in their Power either to make choise of the good Bishop *Sabinus*, or to reject the bad Bishop *Basilides*. And this is plainly to affirm that the People have the Right of Elections. Seing the Queen has it in her Power to

determine whether the present Chancellor shall continue to fill that Post, or he shall be brought in who serv'd in the former Reign, none will call it in Question that she has the Power of Electing the Chancellor, but unreasonable and contentious Persons. It is evident then, from the whole Series and Drift of this Epistle, that the meaning of the Sentence, *Quando Plebs ipsa maxime habeat potestatem vel eligendi dignos sacerdotes, vel indignos recusandi*, is, and can be no other than this, that the power of electing Bishops is lodged in the People, or body of the Church.

Now tho the thing is thus clear and evident, *J. S.* can tell us, that this Sentence we are speaking of, has nothing to do with choosing Bishops by popular Votes when a Chair is vacant, and that all aim'd at, is, That the People have an inherent Right to separate from Bishops when their Communion are so Polluted (as *Basilides's* was) that they cannot be continued in, without manifest hazard of their Souls who continue in them. And as to the three Scripture-Precedents of *Eleazar*, *Matthias* and *Barsabas*, and the seven Deacons, he affirms that thir *African* Bishops adduce them only to prove, that the People have a Right to give Testimony to the Life and Conversation of these who are to be made their Bishops.

But *J. S.* abuses *Cyprian* and thir *African* Bishops, by putting this Gloss upon their Words, and saying that they intended to affirm and prove no more but that the People have a Right to separate from the Communion of the Bishops when they are so polluted that they cannot be continued in without hazard, and by this means makes their Synodical Epistle Impertinent and Ridiculous, as if it had been writ by Men that were not in their right Senses. For,

1. By putting this gloss upon their Words, he makes them give an impertinent, wheedling, ambiguous and contradictory Answer to this People, and which could afford them no Satisfaction at all, an Answer which had another meaning than the Words they expressed it by, did naturally bear, which is inconsistent with that Simplicity and plain way of dealing which was among Christians in those Days. In the first place, he makes thir *Africans* give an Answer that was impertinent and not to the purpose: The People have an inherent Right to separate from the Communion of Bishops when they are so polluted that they cannot be continued in without hazard, answer thir *Africans* according to *J. S.* that is, They inform the People only what to do when *Basilides* is repon'd by the Bishops of the Province. But this People did not inquire how they should carry to *Basilides* when restor'd to their Episcopal Chair, whether then they should separate from him or not? But whether they should dismiss their present Bishop *Sabinus* who was a blameless Person, and with whom they were well pleas'd, and admit the Scandalous *Basilides*, if the Bishops of the Province should press him on them? In the next place, he makes them to give a wheedling and ambiguous Answer, for they say, *That the People themselves have the Power either of electing good Bishops, or rejecting bad ones*, not intending hereby to assert that the People have the power of electing their Bishops when their Chair is vacant; yet if they had intended to assert this, they could scarcely have expressed themselves more clearly and positively. Then he makes them give an Answer that was unsatisfactory, for it left the People in the same perplexity they were in before they consulted with thir *Africans*: You should separate from the Communion of a Scandalous and Prophane Bishop, say the *Africans*; but the Bishops of the Province

would Answer to the People, *Basilides* is no more Prophane but Penitent, his former Crimes are blotted out by Repentance, and his being restor'd by the Bishop to Clerical Communion. And then this Answer which *J. S.* makes them give, is contradictory; for they instruct the People to separate from *Basilides* when put in their Chair by the Bishops of the Province, and yet advise them not to part with their present Bishop *Sabinus* nor to receive *Basilides* tho the Bishops of the Province should be for putting him in their Chair. Indeed if they had made an Alternative of it, had advis'd the People to do what in them lay to hinder the Reposition of *Basilides*, but if the Bishops should restore him to their Chair over their Belly, then to separate from him, that would have been something purpose like: But there is no such thing, thir *Africans* advise the People positively to adhere to *Sabinus* most firmly, and never to condescend to the Reposition of *Basilides*, nor suffer him to set his Foot in their Episcopal Chair, yet notwithstanding they spend the most part of their Epistle in bearing in upon them, that a People fearing God should separate from Scandalous Bishops, and consequently that they should separate from *Basilides* when he should be put in Possession again of their Episcopal Chair.

2. *J. S.* makes thir *Africans* in their Answer to affirm one thing and to confirm another thing, to say one thing, and then in stead of proving what they said, and intended and propos'd to themselves to prove, to prove another thing which was of a quite different Nature. *Quando Plebs ipsa*, say they, *Maxime habeat potestatem vel eligendi dignos sacerdotes, vel indignos recusandi, quod & ipsum videmus de divina Auctoritate descendere, ut sacerdos Plebe præsente sub omnium oculis deligatur, & dignus atque idoneus publico judicio ac testimonio comprobetur, sicut in Numeris Dominus Moyse præcipit*, then they adduce the Examples of *Eleazar*,

Eleazar, Matthias & Barsabas, and of the seven Deacons we were speaking of. You see that the thing which they affirm is this, *Plebs ipsa maxime habet potestatem vel dignos sacerdotes eligendi, vel indignos recusandi*, and this they say is of Divine appointment, and that it is of Divine appointment they undertake to prove by the Scripture Examples of the Elections of *Eleazar, Matthias* and *Barsabas*, and the seven Deacons. And *J. S.* tells us, that the meaning of the Sentence, *Quando plebs ipsa maxime habeat potestatem vel eligendi, &c.* is, that the People have an inherent Right to separate from the Communion of Bishops when they are so polluted, &c. And the same *J. S.* tells us, that thir *Africans* adduce thir three Scripture Examples of *Eleazar, &c.* to prove that the People have a Right to give Testimony to the Life and Conversation of these who are to be made their Bishops. According to this then; thir *Africans* should have, and did intend to prove that the People have an inherent Right to separate from the Communion of Bishops when they are so polluted that they cannot be continued in &c. but instead of proving this, they set themselves to prove, that the People have a Right to give Testimony to the Life and Conversation of these to be made their Bishops. It seems *J. S.* is for making the venerable Bishops of this ancient *African Synod Dunces* in good earnest.

3. Thir Arguments, or three Scripture Precedents, neither prove that for which *J. S.* pretends thir *African* Fathers adduced or made use of them, nor that which the Series of their Discourse makes evident that they intended to prove by them, if *J. S.*'s gloss be put upon their Word. If we look to the Series of the Discourse, that which thir *African* Fathers proposed to themselves to prove by these Scripture Precedents, is that *Plebs ipsa maxime habet potestatem vel eligendi dignos sacerdotes vel indig-*

nos recusandi, and if you put *J. S.*'s gloss upon these Words, and say that all aim'd at by them, is only this, That the People have an inherent Right to separate from the Communions of Bishops when they are so polluted that they cannot be continued in without hazard, you will make the *African* Fathers to argue after this manner, *Eleazar* was constituted High Priest publicly in the face of the Congregation, *Matthias* and *Barsabas*, and the seven Deacons were elected by the People, therefore the People have an inherent Right to separate from the Communions of Bishops when they are so polluted that they cannot be continued in without hazard. But there is no Connexion or Coherence here, nor any thing that looks like common Sense in such reasoning. And as little do thir Precedents prove that which *J. S.* says they intended to prove by them, to wit, That the People have a Right to give Testimony, or should be call'd to bear Witness to the Life and Conversation of these who are to be made their Bishops. Not the first Precedent, or that of *Eleazar*; when *Eleazar* was constituted High Priest, *Numb.* 20, 25. the Congregation was assembled for another end than to bear Testimony to his Life and Conversation, God needed not convene the People that they might inform him what *Eleazar*'s Conversation and Life was. As to the third Precedent, there is not one word of the People's giving Testimony to the Conversation of these that were to be Constituted Deacons, this was not propos'd by the Apostles, or in the least motion'd to the People, but when the Apostles conven'd the Multitude, the thing propos'd to them was this, to choose or elect seven of their Number to be constituted Deacons. And as to the second Precedent, it is as little to the purpose as any of the former, there is not one word of the 120 Disciples or the People's being call'd to give Testimony to the Life of these whom the

the Apostles should nominate, but *Peter* proposed to them, that they should elect two, which they did, and one of these that they elected, was substituted in the room of *Judas*.

I hope that it is now evident, that *J. S.* has abused his *African* Bishops, has made them speak things they never dream'd of, has put a Sense upon their Words which they cannot be made to bear, a Sense which the drift, Series and scope of their whole Epistle notoriously rejects. And seeing the Sense that we have put upon the words is Natural, and if it be followed, the Epistle will be consistent with it self, and the rest of *Cyprian's* Works, and the Arguments strong and conclusive, and their Fathers will be made to give a Sentence conform to Scripture and the Practice of the Universal Church, what more clear than that it is the true and only Sense?

But if the Sense we have put upon the Words is the true Sense, and their *African* Fathers intended to assert that the People have the Power and Right to Elect their own Bishops, how thought they to prove this by the Example of *Eleazar*? Who can imagine, says *J. S.* that *Cyprian* and his Collegues were such *Dunces* as not to have known that neither *Eleazar* nor *Matthias* was chosen by popular Voices? This is the only plausible thing *J. S.* has said upon the Head, the rest of his Subterfuges are but miserable and mean Shifts. To this I say,

1. What if I should say, I cannot tell how their *African* Bishops thought to prove the Divine Right of popular Elections by this Precedent of *Eleazar*? Will it thence follow, that *J. S.*'s groundless Fancy must take place? What if I should say that it is highly possible that these Bishops (especially if we suppose them to have written this Epistle in haste) might have been capable of such a harmless Mistake as this, that *Eleazar* was Elected by the People's suffrages when he was not? What Danger can there

there be in such a Plea? Certainly such an Oversight, being at most but an escape of Memory can never weaken their Authority in any matter of consequence. And the truth is, it is very possible they might fall into a little Mistake here thro' Forgetfulness. However, this is enough to stop *J. S's*. Mouth, for this is the very Answer he gave on a certain occasion, when he knew not well how to reconcile some thing *Cyprian* had said, with his Hypothesis. See *Vind. Prin. Cypr. age*, p. 236. And what if I should say,

2. That these *African* Bishops had not perhaps the manner of *Eleazar's* Election in View, but consider'd only, that he was Constituted or Instal'd in his Office publicly, and before the face of the Congregation, and thence infer'd, that a Bishop should be created in a publick way, that is publickly Elected by the Suffrages of all the People, or whole Fraternity, and ordain'd by Imposition of the hands of the Bishops in the face of the Congregation? Inferences as unexact as this, are some times to be seen in the Works of *Cyprian*.

3. If the first Precedent, the Constitution of *Eleazar*, did not so very nicely suite the Case of popular Elections, What then? seeing the other two answer it exactly. *Matthias* (*Acts* ch. 1.) was without doubt Elected by the People. But *Matthias* was chosen by Lot. True, but the two Persons *Matthias* and *Barsabas* were chosen by the People, that one of them might be made Apostle by Lot, and this was sufficient for the purpose of our *African* Bishops, and makes it evident to a Demonstration, that the Church it self (and not its Officers or Rulers) is by God's appointment the Source of Elections, if the Power of Elections was lodged in the Church Rulers, why did not the Apostles themselves Elect *Matthias* and *Barsabas*? The *African* Fathers then did very pertinently make use of this Precedent

to confirm the Divine Institution of popular Elections.

As to the seven Deacons it is no less evident, that they were chosen by the People, and *J. S.* himself does not deny it. And hence it is demonstrable, let him say what he will, that by Divine Authority they have a Right to Elect their Bishops. To think that God would give them a Right to Elect some Church Officers, and not to Elect others of them, is Irrational. They tell us ordinarily, it will not follow that because they have a Right to choose inferior Officers, therefore they should have a Right to Elect their Bishops who are superior Officers, *a minori ad majus non valet consequentia*. Say I, they have a Right to choose their Deacons, therefore *a fortiori* they have a Right to Elect their Bishops. A Man has a Right to choose his Servant, therefore much more has he a Right to choose his Wife, because his Interest and Happiness depends much more on the right Election of a Wife. The Interest of the Church depends much more on the Bishops than the Deacons, therefore if it has a Right to Elect its Deacons, much more should it be supposed that it has a Right to Elect its Bishops. Then the People Elected *Matthias* and *Barsabas*, one of which was to be made an Apostle, and that was more than to Elect ten Bishops; to have a power to Elect two, that one of them may be made Admiral, is more than to have a Power to Elect ten Captains of Frigats.

Then say they, the People are not competent Judges of the Qualifications or fitness of Persons to be made Bishops, therefore they can have no Right to Elect them. Why then did not the Apostles say to the People (*Act 1.*) you are not Capable to judge of the Qualifications requisite in an Apostle, therefore not you, but we must Elect two Persons, that one of them may be made Apostle in the room of *Judas*? If one should pretend that the People of *Rome*, being a Company made up of Trades-men, Weavers, Coblers, &c, were very un-

fit to judge of the Qualifications requisite in a General or Consul, and never did choose them, that it is much more rational to think that the Senate did Elect them, a Court in which there were many Persons who had been, or were fit to be Consuls or Generals themselves, would not that be to speak ignorantly and senselessly? There was more Skill in the Senate, but the body of the Commonwealth had more Interest in the Elections, and therefore it was agreeable to common Sense, that the power of Elections should be lodged in the whole body of the People, seeing naturally the right of Elections resideth in them who have the greatest Interest. Perhaps one witty Fellow, such as *Diogenes*, was as able to discern, or had more skill to judge what Persons were fittest to be made Magistrates, or to be put in such or such Offices, than the whole Body of the *Athenian* People, who were made up of Merchants and Trades-men, and Persons of very ordinary Capacities; But would it not be ridiculous to infer hence, that the Power of Elections was not, or should not have been lodged in the body of the People of *Athens*, but in *Diogenes*? And the Reason is evident, for tho *Diogenes* had more skill that way than most or all the Citizens of *Athens*, yet he could not pretend to the like Interest, and the Right of Election belongs to them who have the greatest Interest. *J. S.* may be, has more skill to manage a Lordship, and to put the Rents belonging thereto to right Uses, than my Lord himself has; but it will not follow, that therefore *J. S.* should spend or dispose upon the Rents of the Lordship; my Lord should do that himself, because he has the Interest. In like manner with respect to the Election of Bishops, the People have the Interest, because the Functions of the Episcopal Office are perform'd to them, and therefore they have the Right to Elect their own Bishop, and it lyes on the Neighbouring Bishops as having more Skill to assist them in their Elections, to give them Advice

Advice, and to direct them, to put the Person Elected to Tryal, &c. as *J. S.* who is a Person of great Skill may give his Lordship Advice to what uses he should put his Rents.

Then the body of the Church or People is not so easily byassed, with respect to Elections, as others, or the Neighbouring Bishops would be, if the Right of Elections were lodged in them. For seeing the Bishop to be chosen is to perform the Works of the Ministry to the People (and not to the Neighbouring Bishops) the *melius esse* at least of their Spiritual State depends much on the Election of a fit Person to fill their Episcopal Chair: And it is difficult to Byass a considering People against their own Interest, unless you will suppose that they are Graceless and Unconcern'd as to their Spiritual State and in that Case I do not pretend that they have the Right of Elections, this being a Privilege which belongs to these who are a *Plebs obsequens præceptis Dominicis & Deum metuens*, to use Cyprian's wise and judicious Words. Does not common Sense inform us, that it is much better that the Power to Elect the King of *Britain* be lodged in the People of *Britain* themselves, than in a Court or Consistory of the European Kings? Is it rational to think that a Consistory of the Kings of *Europe* would have as tender a regard to the Interest of the People of *Britain* as the People of *Britain* themselves? Might they not be much more easily Byassed in an Affair which their Interest is not much concerned in (supposing their Interest to be as little concern'd in the Election of a *British* King, as is the Interest of a Synod or Presbytery of Neighbouring Bishops in the Election of a Bishop to a Vacant Church) than it would be possible to get the People of *Britain* Byassed against their own Interest, whether to Elect a Papist, treacherous Person, or an Idiot to be their King? We may be sure, that the good of the Church is that which Christ looks to,

and not the secular Interest of some particular Persons ; Ministers, Bishops, Presbyters and all, were instituted for no other end, but to be subservient thereto : Wherefore it is most certain, that God has placed the Right of Electing Bishops where the greater good of the Church requires that it should be placed. And seing it is as much contrary to the Interest of a Church that the Right of Electing their Bishop, should be placed in others than themselves, as it would be contrary to the Interest of the People of *Britain*, that the Right to Elect a King and Parliament for them should be lodged in a Foreign State or Court, we may conclude with the greatest Evidence and Certainty imaginable that God has not given the Right to Elect a Bishop for a Church, to the Neighbouring Bishops or the Bishops of the Province (far less to a Patron, it being notoriously evident that a Turk or a Pagan will have as much regard to the Spiritual Interest of a Church, as a Prophane or Self-seeking Patron) but to the Church it self. What a pitiful and weak Contrivance is it then to devolve the Election of a Bishop on the Bishops of the Province ? How contrary to common Sense and the Maxims of Government ? Must the Major of *London* be chosen by the Majors of the Neighbouring Cities ? How comes it that the Church of *England* never thinks of devolving the Election of a Bishop to a Vacant Church, upon the rest of the Bishops ?

4. The *African* Bishops speak in this Epistle, not only with respect to the Election of a Bishop by the Suffrages of the People, but also with respect to Ordination by imposition of Hands (which was perform'd by the Bishop of the Province, at least in and after *Cyprian's* time) and confound them together, so that what they say must sometimes be understood with reference to the one, sometimes to the other, sometimes to both, according to the Nature of the thing. *In ordinationibus sacerdotum*

non nisi immaculatos & integros Antistites eligere debemus, say they, and, *Et manus ei in locum Basilidis imponeretur*. Wherefore it may be said that thir Fathers intended to confirm or prove two things by these three Scripture Precedents, to wit, That a Bishop should be ordain'd publicly, or that hands should be laid on him before the face of the Congregation; The other is, that he should also be Elected publicly, or by the Suffrages of the whole People of the Church assembled together. To the first of these, the Precedent of *Eleazar* answereth exactly, for he was Constituted, Instal'd or Ordain'd publicly, in the presence of the People, and it appears that this is the use that thir *Africans* intended to make of the Example of *Eleazar*, to wit, to shew that a Bishop should be ordain'd publicly, for when they propose it they subjoin or infer, *Coram omni Synagoga jubet Deus constitui sacerdotem, id est, instruit & ostendit ORDINATIONES Sacerdotiales non nisi sub Populi assistentis conscientia fieri oportere*. And the other thing, to wit, that the Bishop should be Elected by the Suffrages of the People, they prove excellently by the Examples of *Matthias*, and the seven Deacons which they propose, who were Elected publicly, and by the Suffrages of the People. And that this was their mind it seems to be evident from what they subjoin. For after they have thus from Scripture manifested the Right method of constituting Bishops, have proven by the Example of *Eleazar* that they should be ordain'd publicly or in the presence of the People, and by the Examples of *Matthias* and *Barsabas*, and the seven Deacons, that they should be Elected publicly, or by the Suffrages of the People, they subjoin, that this Scripture method was exactly followed by this People in *Spain* they were writing to, in the Constitution of their Bishop *Sabinus*. *Quod & apud vos factum videmus*, say they, in *Sabini Collegæ nostri*

nostri ordinatione, ut de universæ Fraternitatis Suffragio, & de Episcoporum qui in præsentia convenerant, quique de eo ad vos literas fecerant, judicio, Episcopatus ei deferretur, & manus ei in locum Basilidis imponeretur.

J. S. objects that the Bishop was not Elected by the Suffrages of the People, but only in their Presence, because *Cyprian* says, *Et Episcopus deligatur Plebe præsentē*. But this is frivolous. *Cyprian* says in other places, and oftner than once or twice, that a Bishop should be, or was Elected by the Suffrages of the People, and not in their presence only: So that in *Cyprian*, *Deligatur Plebe præsentē*, is as much as *Deligatur Suffragiis Plebis præsentis*. Thus *J. S.* himself says, that the People gave Testimony to the Life and Conversation of the Bishop to be constituted, discover'd the Faults of the Evil, or published the Merits of the Good, wherefore when *Cyprian* says, *Ut Plebe præsentē vel detegantur malorum crimina vel bonorum merita prædicentur*, his meaning was not, that the Faults of the Evil should be discovered by others than the People in their presence, but that their Faults should be discovered by the People themselves there present; in like manner the meaning of *Deligatur Episcopus Plebe præsentē*, is not that the Bishop was Elected by other than the People in their presence, but that he was Elected by the People being there present. In like manner *Cyprian* says, with respect to the Election of the seven Deacons (*Acts 6.*) *Quod tam diligenter & caute convocata Plebe tota gerebatur*, but these seven Deacons were Elected by the People: wherefore, the Deacons were elected the Whole People being call'd together, is as much as to say, that they were Elected by the whole being call'd together.

In the next place, *J. S.* comes to give us a plain and positive account, as he says, of the Creation of Bishops in those Days. How were they Elected then?

then? They were Elected, says he, by the Bishops of the Province, thus says *Cyprian*, *Sabinus* the Successor of *Basilides* was promoted to the Bishoprick by the Suffrages, that is according to *J. S.* by the Approbation or Good liking of the whole Brotherhood, * and by the Judgment (*Judicio*) of the Bishops who were present. If this be, *Judicium* must signify, *Suffrage* or *Elective Voice*; But who informed *J. S.* that *Suffragium Populi* signifies only, the People's Approbation, or Good-liking, and that *Judicium* signifies *Elective Voice*? Is it not a wonder that the Man could have the Confidence to advance such things without the least shadow of Probation, without being able to let us see that these words may be taken in such a Sense, by so much as one Example out of any Author whatsoever, Sacred or Prophane? If one may take the Liberty to cause words signify what he pleases, or take them in a Sense unknown to the whole World excepting himself, he may easily prove the Bishop's Chancellour's Court out of *Cyprian's* or *Ignatius's* Epistles, and Prelacy from *Virgil's Georgicks*, or *Ovid's Metamorphosis*. But if *J. S.* will be at the pains to look his Dictionary, he will find that *Judicium* signifies *Approbation* or *Advice*; so that the meaning of *Cyprian* and the *African* Bishops is, that the People Elected *Sabinus*, and the Bishops of the Province approved their Choice, or had advised them to pitch on that Person.

J. S.

* It is a wonder that *J. S.* could not perceive the unreasonableness of what he here says, or the Impertinency of this gloss, if this gloss is true, he Brotherhood had no more Interest in the Election of a Bishop than the Sisterhood had, *Sabinus* no doubt had the Approbation and Good-liking of the sisters, as well as of the Brethren, how comes it then that *Cyprian* says he was promoted to the Bishoprick by the suffrages of the Brotherhood, being he was promoted as much by the suffrages of the Sisterhood? Neither does *J. S.'s* Hypothesis hang well together, according to him the Bishop was Monarch of his Church. But by what Rules of Government is a Monarch Elected by the Neighbouring Monarchs? This was never practis'd since the flood of *Noah*, the most barbarous and stupid Nations were never guilty of such a solecism.

J. S. adduces the Testimony of *Lampridius* to no purpose in this case. Might not *Lampridius* affirm that the Christians us'd to proclaim the Names of such as were to be ordain'd Bishops, without pretending to deny that these Bishops were Elected by the Suffrages of the People before they were ordain'd, or proclaim'd either perhaps? Abundance of Law breaks not Law, as we use to say. What to make of *the People standing by* out of Origen, it is easily to guess by what has been said.

Pag. 418, J. S. proposes an Argument (if what he says deserves to be so call'd) to prove that the People in *Cyprian's* time could have no definitive Voices in matters of Government or Discipline, even in particular Churches. What he says comes to this. Even the Martyrs and Confessors themselves had no such power, tho they were held in mighty Reputation, were reckon'd Christians of highest Note and greatest Value, &c. to Petition was all their Prerogative amounted to. And because the Martyrs had not a Definitive Voice, he concludes that the People had not. Whether the People had Definitive Voices in the Affairs of Discipline, or not, in those days, is what we are not at present concern'd with; But least he should pretend to infer, the Martyrs had no decisive Voice in Affairs of Government, therefore they had no Voice in the Election of Church Officers, and seeing the Martyrs such privileged Persons could not Elect a Bishop, therefore the People could not. I must tell him, that this has no weight at all. It is to argue after this Fashion. The *milites emeriti* among the *Romans*, or one single Tribe by it self, could not make a Law, or create a Consul, therefore the *Roman* People could not, or the Dukes and Marqueesses in *Scotland* cannot by themselves settle the Union, therefore they cannot in Conjunction with the Parliament. The Martyrs tho they were the Noblest
part

part of the Church, yet they were but a part of it; and to infer that because a part of the Church could not do such a thing, therefore the whole Church could not, is a piece of Weakness indeed.

We shall conclude this Point with setting down the Opinion of two Divines of the Church of England of the first rank, excellent Persons both of them, whose great Names will obscure *J. S.* extraordinarily. The first is *Dr. Barrow*, who gives this account of the Creation of Bishops in *Cyprian's* time, *The neighbouring Bishops*, says he, (*being advertised of a Vacancy*) *did convene at the place; then in the Congregation the Clergy of the place did propound a Person, yielding their Attestation of his fitness, which the People hearing, did give their Suffrages, accepting him if no weighty Cause was objected, or refusing him if such cause did appear: then the Bishops present did adjoin their APPROBATION and Consent, upon such Recommendation and Acceptance, and layed on hands.* *Popes Supr: p. 326. in Quart: The other D. Pearson Bishop of Chester, Tho,* says he with respect to the Creation of a Bishop, *Cyprian attributes Testimony to the Clergy, and Elective Voice to the People, the Cardinal on the contrary, gives Elective voice to the Clergy, and only Testimony to the People, which means he destroys the People's Elective Voice, which Cyprian every where asserts, then he tells us, that Cyprian's words will not at all bear the Cardinal's that is J. S's.) gloss. Annal. Cypr. pag. 29.*

This, that the People elected their Bishops in the third Century, is a Truth so certain and evident, that the Popish Doctors, these among them, to wit, who are Men of Honour and Integrity, offer not to call it in question, and affirm it very positively. Thus *Du Pin* in his Abridgment of the Discipline in the third Century, says, *That Christians took great care in the choice of their Ministers, to elect such Persons, whose Life and Conversation was unblamable.*

After the Death of those who had been ordain'd by the Apostles, the People Elected. The Bishops were generally ordain'd by their Brethren, who imposed the Hands upon them. And he gives us this account of the manner of the Creation of Bishops in the fourth Century. When a Bishop died, says he, all the Bishops of the Province were called together to ordain a Successor in his Room, he was commonly chosen by the Clergy and People of the vacant Church. And to L. Pin we may add Rigaltius who is no less positive as to this particular, and whose Honesty and Ingenuity may put many who profess themselves to be Protestants to the blush.

Nay the impudent Jesuite Bellarmin himself could not for shame absolutely deny this palpable and evident matter of Fact, and was forced to betake himself to this silly and childish shift, that where the People enjoy'd this Privilege in Ancient time they enjoy'd it by the Condescendance of the Bishops * and particularly the Bishop of Rome. And it appears that M. Dodwell is convinced in his Conscience that the People did elect their own Bishops and enjoy'd several other Privileges in the Government, in the Primitive times, else he needed not have betaken himself to Bellarmin's shift, and shew'd us several things, (in the 19 Chap: of his Separation of Churches, &c. from § 18.) which, as he says, might induce the Church-Rulers to condescend to the

* Says the learn'd M. Le Blanc, *Donique de electione sive designatione certorum personarum ad munera Ecclesiastica*; Bellarminus & alii Pontifici cum concedunt, illam in antiqua Ecclesia, multis saltem in locis, penes Populum Christianum fuisse, adeo ut communibus Populi Suffragiis futuri Episcopi & Pastores eligerentur ---- quidquid autem aliquando hac in re Populus potuit, pertendendum illum totum habuisse ex conniventia vel ex concessione Pontificum Romanorum. Qua tamen in re non puto Pontificios omnes Bellarmino astipulatos, sed illos solum qui sunt Papae magis addicti. Cap. 4. *De Institutione sive Creatione Ministrorum Ecclesiae*. Have we not reason then to be astonished at J. S. that he could affirm positively and without any Scruple of Conscience, that there are no evidences that the People elected their Bishops, Nay nor Intimations of such a power at all discoverable. Wonderful! That not discoverable which Papists and Protestants and all the Christians in the World are convinced of.

the People, or part with some of their just Rights to
o them. It is not ingenuous, says M. *Dodwell*
here, to make *Condescension* an Argument against
Right. What should be said to such an Answer as
his? What can stand before such a Contrivance?
How easy would it have been to the Fathers of
the Council of *Constance* to invent several prudential
Considerations that might induce the Apostles,
and afterward the Bishops to *Condescend* to the People,
and allow them to Communicate *sub utraque*
specie, and enjoy the Privilege of the Ecclesiastical
Cup? And then to tell them, that it is disingenuous
to make *Condescension* an Argument against
Right.

J. S. has told us that *Cyprian* and the rest of the
African Bishops were not such *Dunces* as not to know
that *Matthias* was not elected by popular Votes:
But he has not undertaken to prove that he was
not so elected, it seems he thought that is a thing
that is Self-evident, or that we might rest satisfied
with what the *London* Ministers have said on this
head in the 8 Chap. of their *jus Div: Minist: Evang:*
supposing that they have put it beyond all doubt
that no Succour can be brought from *Matthias's* Election
in order to the Confirmation of the popular
Election of Bishops; and consequently, that either
the *African* Bishops were very ridiculous, or had no
Intentions to establish popular Elections in the 67
Epistle we have been speaking of. Wherefore that
it may appear yet more evidently that the *African*
Fathers did very pertinently adduce the Example
of this Person's Election to the Apostolical Office
for the end we have said; And seeing the People's
having a Power to elect their Bishops, is a Capital
Point, and as the great M. *Dallie* judiciously observes,
the true Basis and Foundation of the Discipline
and Ministry of the Church, and that therefore
it is very requisite that our People's Faith as

to this Point be fixed on a clear and solid Foundation ; seing also that, if we make good one Scripture Argument and make it appear, that it stands firm notwithstanding all that can be invented by the wit of Man against it, we prove the Point to a Demonstration, and put it beyond doubt that popular Calls are a Divine Institution, or that the Power of choosing their Pastors is a Right, a Grant, a Legacy of our Saviour's left to the People as *G. R.* somewhere affirms ; before we put an end to this Discourse, we intend to examine what the Reverend *London* Ministers have said in their foresaid eighth Chapter with respect to this particular, thinking it needless to meddle with what they say there concerning the Election of the Deacons, seing *J. S.* himself grants that the People did elect the Deacons. To come to the purpose then,

The Proposition they lay down in that eighth Chapter is this, *That the Election of a Minister or Bishop, doth not of right belong wholly and solly to the major part of every particular Congregation.* They tell us that the Election of a Bishop or Minister doth not belong to the major Part of every Church or Congregation wholly and solly, but they tell us not what they understand by this *wholly* and *solly*, they tell us not how far the Power of Election belongs to the major part of a Congregation, what of this Power belongs to others, and who these others are. And who doth not see, that to handle things thus indistinctly, tends to the obscuring rather than the clearing them. The addition of the Word *Every*, leaves room to doubt whether they thought that some or many or most particular Congregations have the whole and sole Power of Elections, and gives occasion to Quiblenent the Right of Heretical or Corrupt Congregations.

If they had told us that the Community of the faithful People, or Body of the Church or Congregation is not the Source of Elections, or if they allow them to be so in part, as it seems they do, if they had told us precisely what share others have in Elections, we might have known better what to have said. However if by *wholly* and *solly* be understood that the Church Officers should not be excluded from Elections, but should Vote together with the People *ex gr*: if there be a Congregation that has a Minister and Elders, or a Bishop and Presbyters, if another Bishop or Minister be to be elected, the Minister they have and the Elders may join with the Congregation in the Election, and give their Suffrages, this I believe will not be much contested. But notwithstanding of this, the power of Elections will be still in the Body of the People: For in this Case, the Minister and Elders will give their Suffrages, not as Church-Officers, but as Members of the Society or Church, neither can they Vote in any other Capacity.

Or if the meaning be, that a Congregation should not fall about the Election of a Minister at random, but should consult with the Presbytery, or neighbouring Bishops, & take their Approbation of the Person with respect to his Abilities & Qualifications for the Sacred Function, before or after they call him; this I think will not or should not be denied. But neither will this hinder the power of Elections to be *wholly* and *solly* in the body of the Church or faithful People. If a Noble Person were to choose a Governour for his Son, he would take the advice of a Person of Learning, and may be cause that Person try him as to his Fitness or Abilities, but still the power of Electing the Governour is in the Nobleman *wholly* and *solly*.

Our Argument they propose in these Terms.
 ' The first, say they, is taken from the choice of
 ' *Matthias,*

Matthias into the Office of an Apostle, which was done by the 120 Disciples there present, and if the People have power to Choose an Apostle, much more to choose an ordinary Minister. But we Answer, that those Words, *And they appointed two, Joseph call'd Barabas and Matthias*, do in all probability relate to the Apostles & not to the Disciples: *They appointed two*, that is, *the Apostles appointed two*: Thus our Annotators, they appointed two, that is, the fore-mentioned Apostles Put two in the Election. And if the History be well observ'd, it will appear, that the 120 Disciples are nam'd only in a Parenthesis, and that *Peter*, in his whole Discourse, relates especially if not only to his Fellow Apostles. It is said, v. 17. he was numbred with us, *i. e.* with the Apostles, not with the Disciples. And so v. 21. which hath companied with us, *i. e.* with us Apostles. v. 22. must one be ordain'd to be a Witness with us, *i. e.* with us Apostles. And then follows, *and they appointed two*, that is, the Apostles and not the 120 Disciples.

Ans. If the Title of this Chapter eighth be considered, and several Expressions the Ministers have in it, one would think they allow the People some share in Elections, but it appears from this Answer, they intended no such thing, for they are for shutting up the Disciples in a Parenthesis, and allow them no share in the Action, but only the favour of being Witnesses to the Election of *Matthias* and *Barabas* performed by the Apostles alone. Yet I must say that they understood their Point better than did our M. *Gillespie* for to allow the People the Right of Elections, and to maintain also that the Church-Officers are the first Subject of the Power of the Keys, or of all Ecclesiastical Power, as he does, is to maintain Contradictions. However it must be granted that M. *Gillespie* was very consequential

quential to himself, in asserting, that the Essence of the Call to the Ministerial Office, or what he calls *Missio potestativa*, lyeth in Ordination and not in Election : For seing he lodgeth the Right of Elections to the Ministerial Office in the People, if he had made the Essence of the Ministerial Call to ly in Election, he had palpably overturned the principal Hypothesis, to wit, that the Church-Officers excluding the People, are the first Subject of the Ecclesiastical Power, or of the Keys. But seing the *London* Ministers do not place the Right of Elections in the body of the People, what could have induced them to maintain that absurd Principle, to wit, that the Essence of the Call to the Ministerial Office lyeth in Ordination, is more than I can understand. But to come to the purpose, I say,

In the first Place, they propose our Argument disadvantageously, which is taken commonly not from the Election of *Matthias*, or the preferring him to the Apostleship before *Barfabas*, which was done by the Lot ; but from the Election of *Matthias* and *Barfabas* out of the Body of the Disciples, or the nominating of them two, and putting them in the List for the Apostleship, which was done not by the Apostles, but by the body of the People. And hence we conclude, that the body of the People have the Right of Elections: For if they had not, why did the Apostles put it upon the People to elect or appoint the two ? If the Church-Officers had the Right of Elections, why did not the Apostles themselves nominate and appoint the two ? If *Peter* had thought that Christ lodged the power of Elections in the Church-Officers and not in the People, he would have made the proposal to the Apostles, and not to the 120 Disciples.

They tell us in the next place, that not the Disciples but the Apostles nominated and appointed the two. But the contrary will appear to any Person

son who reads the History. They nominated and appointed the two, to whom *Peter* directed his Discourse (*Acts* 1. from v. 15. to 23.) and to whom in his Discourse he made the proposal that one should be put in the place of *Judas* : But *Peter* directed his Discourse, and consequently made the Proposal not to the Apostles, but to the Disciples : And this is evident, because *Peter* directed his Discourse to those in the mids of whom he stood up, but he stood up in the mids of the Disciples. *And in those days Peter stood up in the mids of the Disciples, and said, Men and Brethren, this Scripture must needs have been fulfilled --- Must one be ordain'd to be a witness with us.* Then the Evangelist adds, *And they appointed two, &c.* to wit, *They* in the mids of whom *Peter* stood up, and to whom he said, *Men and Brethren, &c.* that is, the 126 Disciples. Nothing can be more Evident,

But say they, the 120 Disciples are named only in a Parenthesis. When *Luke* is giving account that *Peter* stood up in the mids of the Disciples, he adds in a Parenthesis, that there were of them there to the Number of one hundred & twenty. But doth *Luke's* telling in a Parenthesis how many Disciples were present, prove that *Peter* did not direct his Discourse to these Disciples, or that he did not make the Proposal to them, and that they did not appoint the two? If an Historian should give account that the Chancellor made a Proposal in Parliament that two Commissioners should be sent up to *London* about some Affair, and should express himself thus, *And in those days the Chancellor stood up in the Parliament, and said (the Number of the Members present were about 120) My Lords and Gentlemen, two Persons must be sent to London, &c.* and if the Historian should add, and *they appointed two*, would any Person conclude, that because an account is given in a Parenthesis how many Members of Parliament were pre-

present, therefore the Chancellor directed his Discourse not to the Parliament, but only to the Officers of State who were also there, and that the Officers of State only nominated the two Commissioners that were sent to *London*? Then they say that *Peter's* Discourse relates principally, if not only to the Apostles, *He was numbred with us to be a witness with us, &c.* What is that to the Purpose? *Peter* in his Discourse to the Disciples says somethings which relate to the Apostles, will it thence follow that *Peter's* Discourse was not directed to the Disciples, nor the proposal made to them, and that the Disciples did not appoint the two? What if the rest of the Apostles had been absent, and if there had been several things in his Discourse relating to himself, or if he had expressed himself thus? *He was number'd among the Apostles together with myself, to be a witness with me, &c.* Should therefore the Words, *And they appointed two*, have been interpreted *And Peter appointed two*?

Dr. Hammond taketh the same course to elude this Argument, alledging that the 120 are but once mention'd, and that in a Parenthesis, and that not they but the Apostles only appointed the two.

In the next place, they say, ' Suppose the two had been appointed by the 120 Disciples, yet we Answer, 1. That the whole and sole Power of choosing was not in the People, for they were guided and directed in their Choice by the Apostles, it was *electio Populi praeuntibus & dirigentibus Apostolis*, and so it comes not up to the proof of the Proposition; The Apostles tell them in express terms, v. 21, 22. That one must be chosen of these Men who accompanied with us since the time that *Jesus* went out and in amongst us. 2. That the People cannot in any good Construction be said to have chosen *Matthias* any more than *Bar-sabas*, for they appointed two, and when the Peo-

ple had made their choice, *Barsabas* was as capable of being an Apostle as *Matthias*. The truth is, *Matthias* was chosen by God himself, and by God only, and therefore it is said v. 24, Thou Lord which knowest the Hearts of all Men, shew whether of these two thou hast chosen. It was the Divine Lot not the 120 that choose the Apostle. *Object*: But it is said, v. 26. He was number'd with the eleven Apostles. *συγκατεψηφισθη*, i. e. say they, he was together chosen by Suffrage of the 120 Disciples. *Ans*: The word *συγκατεψηφισθη* primarily and properly signifieth to choose by Stones or Counters, with which they were wont to give Voices in Commission or Judgment, but here it must necessarily be taken in a more general Sense, for the general Consent and Approbation of the whole Company; for it is certain that *Matthias* was chosen by Lot, and not by Stones; by God, and not by the People. And therefore when it is said *He was number'd*, the meaning is, he was acknowledged to be one of the twelve Apostles, they all rested contented with the Lot, as being confident that God disposed and approved the event thereof.

For Answer, As to the first thing, that the Apostles guided and directed the Disciples in their choice, and therefore the power of Election was not in the People wholly and solly. We pretend to no other whole and sole Power of Election in the People but such as this. No Election is perform'd in the Church of *Scotland* without some Minister or Ministers presiding, and guiding the Action. If the Apostles only guided and directed the Disciples in their choice, the Disciples choosed, and not the Apostles. If a faithful and skilful Neighbour guide and direct a Friend in his choice of a Servant, he chooseth his Servant wholly and solly. Indeed if the Apostles had nominated the two, and the Disciples had been confin'd to that

Nomination, or obliged to acquiesce when the Apostles made the choice, that would have been something, but no such thing appears from the History. the Disciples were left to the freedom of their own choice. The Election of *Matthias* and *Barsabas* was *electio Populi praeuntibus & dirigentibus Apostolis*, and so was the Election of a Magistrate at *Athens*, *electio Populi praeuntibus & dirigentibus Thesmotheis*, and at *Rome* it was *electio Populi praeuntibus & dirigentibus Tribunis Plebis*, yet no Person will deny that the Power of Elections was in the *Roman* and *Athenian* People wholly and solely.

Then say they, the Apostles limited the 120 to a certain set of Men, they were obliged to Elect two out of these that had accompanied with the Apostles all the time that Christ was with them. It is true the Disciples were limited to that set of Men, and could not go either to the Synagogue or Heathen to Elect, but they were limited to this, not so much by the Authority of the Apostles, as the Nature of the thing. I suppose that if the Apostles themselves had taken upon them to make this Election, the Ministers would not have denied them the whole and sole Power of Election, yet they would have been limited this way as well as the Disciples were.

As to the next thing, That it cannot in any good Construction be said that they Elected *Matthias* any more than *Barsabas*, it is not to the purpose, for as was said, the stress of the Argument lyes upon the electing or appointing the two, which was done by the People and not by the Apostles. If it be said it will not follow that the People have a Right to Elect their Bishop, because the People elected two, one of which was taken to be an Apostle. I say it will follow very clearly. For its being put upon the People by the Direction of the *Holy Ghost* to Elect the two, manifesteth that the People are the Source of Elections, if the Church-

Rulers had been the Source, or if the Right of Elections had been lodged in them by the will of God, the Apostles would have elected or appointed the two, whereupon we thus argue, They in whom God hath lodged the Right of Elections, and they only, should nominate and elect Bishops or Pastors, but God has lodged the Right of Elections in the body of the People, therefore Bishops or Pastors should be nominated and elected by the body of People. Further, the People here did all that could be done by Men in the Affair, they Elected two, and did not nominate the individual Person, not because they were not the Source of Elections, but because the Person to be Elected was to be put in the Apostolical Office, and it was requisite that an Apostle should be Elected in an extraordinary way, and in some sort immediately by *Jesus Christ*, as *M. Claude* doth observe.

But that we may omit nothing that can be said on this head, it is told us, *Jus Div. Regi; Eccl; p. 99 in Marg:* out of some Author, 'The Text doth not make it clear that this Nomination of *Matthias* and *Barsabas* was by the Church or body of the People, but rather the contrary may be collected v. 25. *And they appointed two*, who appointed them? viz. *Peter* and the Disciples that were assembled together, v. 15. And this Assembly was a Council or Synod of the Apostles and Disciples (the first Council mentioned after Christ) extraordinarily met for choosing an extraordinary Officer, even an Apostle in the place of *Judas*, which Election was also managed in an extraordinary way, to wit by Lot, wherein they had recourse to God's immediate Providence. And therefore hence to Argue to an ordinary Election of an ordinary Pastor, is very invalid. To this I say,

First, Whether this Church, Society, or body of People met in an ordinary or extraordinary way is not to the Point; what ever way they met, they E-

lected

lected *Matthias* and *Barsabas*, or appointed the two, that one of them might take the place of *Judas*. And therefore much more have the People now a Power to Elect ordinary Officers.

As to what he says in the *Second* place, That the 120 was a Council or Synod of Church-Officers or Ministers; If he had made that good, he had spoil'd the Demonstration indeed. But that he neither did nor could prove, only it must be suppos'd because the Hypothesis requires it. In the first place the People must have no Ecclesiastical Power, this is the Hypothesis which must be adher'd to most firmly, come of it what will. Wherefore in the next place, it is impossible that *Matthias* and *Barsabas* could be Elected by the People, and therefore the 120 Disciples who Elected them, must be converted into a Synod of Ministers, or it must be suppos'd that they were Church-Rulers. This is truly to handle Scripture after the *Socinian* Mode. Thus they lay down this Hypothesis that Christ is not God in a proper Sense. Wherefore in the next place, it is impossible that he could be in Heaven before he was born of the *Virgin Mary*. But because it is positively asserted in some Texts of Scripture that Christ came down from Heaven and was actually there before either his Resurrection or Ascension, that they may elude these Texts, they suppose without any Probation at all, or feign that he was taken up to Heaven Corporally, and remain'd some time there, before He enter'd upon His publick Ministry. Thus this Author supposes without any Ground at all, that the 126 was a Synod or Council, and if the Hypothesis had required that they should have been a Company of Astrologers or Mathematicians, who doubts but it would have been a very sound Doctrine to affirm it. But if we may make what Supposition we please and build Theological Conclusions upon them, I know no Text of Scripture that will be able to stand out against such

such Art. It never enter'd into the thoughts of Cyprian and these Bishops who were with him when he wrote Epist. 67. that these Disciples were Church-Officers, for there he saith, *Quod postea secundum Divina Magisteria observatur in actis Apostolorum, quando de ordinando in locum Judæ Apostolo Petrus ad plebem loquitur, surrexit, inquit, Petrus in medio discipulorum, fuit autem turba in uno.*

Now after all, I confess I can see no Reason why it may not be said that Matthias was elected to the Apostolical Office by the People or 120. For the Lot is of popular Institution * as well as the Cheirotonia or Election by Suffrages, or at least in popular common-wealths Persons use to be chosen to Offices by Lot, as well as by Suffrage, and these whom the People Elect to Offices by giving forth of Lots, are Electèd to these Offices by the People, and made such Officers, as well as these whom they Elect by their Suffrages. There is nothing more ordinary, in popular Commonwealths than the Election of Officers or Magistrates by Lot. Thus Saul was chosen to be King of Israel by Lot. Thus Athens the Senat of the Bean consisting of 400 Persons was chosen by Lot, which us'd to be perform'd by Beans: And this Senate was divided by Lot into four parts call'd Prytanys, every one of which Prytanys were in Office, for a quarter of a year Tour about, the first Prytany for the first Quarter, &c. Also the great Court there call'd the Heliaa was chosen the same way. And at this day in Venice out of the Consiglio de Dieti, or Council of Ten, there are three chosen by Lot every Month, call'd Capi de Dieti, and of these three one is chosen by Lot every Week, who is the Provost of the Dieti. And these Persons who are Electèd to Offices by

Lot

† Quæ ratio per Electionem Republicæ Aristocraticæ maxime etiam conveniebat, sicut Sortitio Republicæ Democraticæ propria est. Nic. Crægius de Repub. Lacedæm. Lib. 2. C. 1. Pag. 81.

Lot in Commonwealths, are Elected to these Offices and made such Officers by the People, as well as they who are Elected by their Suffrages. The Prytanes whom the People of *Athens* Elected by Lot, were Elected by the *Athenians* as well as the ten *Proedri* or Presidents of the Prytanes in Office, whom the Prytanes Elected by Suffrage. And who will deny that the *Capi de Dieci* in *Venice* are chosen by the *Venetians*, and made such Officers by them, as well as the Major of *London* is Elected by the People there, and constituted such an Officer, tho' the *Venetians* Elect the *Capi de Dieci* by Lot, and the People of *London* choose the Major by Suffrage. Thus tho' *Saul* was chosen King of *Israel* by Lot wholly, both the Tribe and Family he belonged to, and his Person being taken by Lot, so that the People did nothing of this by Suffrage, yet it is said that *The People made Saul King before the Lord in Gilgal*.

It will be said that *Saul* was made King of *Israel* by Lot at *Mizpeh*, but the People made him King at another time, and in another place, to wit, *Gilgal*, therefore there is no Ground for saying that the People made him King by their Lots. But I Answer, There was no new Election at *Gilgal*, but a Confirmation of the Election at *Mizpeh*, or a publick Declaration of their Adherence thereto, wherefore their making him King at *Gilgal*, was an owning that they had made him King by their Lots, at *Mizpeh*, and a confirming of his Right. Seeing then *Saul* was made King by Lots, and not seeing the People made him King, it is evident that the People made him King at *Mizpeh* by their Lots. The People conven'd at *Gilgal* to make *Saul* King, by the Advice of *Samuel*, who said to them, *Come let us renew the Kingdom*. If the Queen had come down to *Scotland* last year, and an Historian giving an account thereof had said, the People of *Scotland* then renewed the Kingdom, nobody would dream of a new Election, or fancy thereby but a Con-

Confirmation of their former Deed, or a renewing of Promises to adhere thereto. The People's renewing the Kingdom to *Saul* then, supposes that they had made him King before, and seing they made him King no other ways but by Lot, the making him King by Lot was the People's Deed and Fact. Further, That the making *Saul* King by Lots was the People's Deed, and not God's, seems to be evident from this, that it was against the Will of God that a Kingly Government was set up in that Nation, and he was highly offended at them for desiring a King, and call'd it a Rebellion, or a rejecting of his Government, wherefore I say, it cannot reasonably be thought that he elected a King to them, but only permitted them to make a King to themselves. Then if that Election had been such that it might be called God's Election (as was that of *Moses* or *David*) it is very probable, that a good Man would have been pitched upon, whereas *Saul* was a prophane Person: The Election then of *Saul* by Lots was properly the People's Deed, and not God's, but by way of common Providence, as *Augustus* is King of *Poland*, or as such a Person is elected by God, Provost of *Edinburgh* or Mayor of *London*.

And seing *Saul* was elected by the People, tho his Election was performed by Lots wholly, much more may it be said that the People or 120 elected *Matthias* or made him Apostle, seing his Election was mix'd, that is, was perform'd partly by the People's Suffrages, and partly by their giving forth of Lots. Neither was the Election of *Matthias* altogether extraordinary. It is true, that in this Election the Lots were guided by a peculiar Providence, and so were the Suffrages of the People guided in as special a manner by the same Providence of *Jesus Christ* when they elected the two, *Matthias* and *Barsabas*. So that there was nothing of extraordinariness in the

Election of *Matthias* by Lot, more than there was in the Election of the same *Matthias* and *Barsabas* by the Suffrages of the 120. And hence it is evident, that the Author cited by the *London* Ministers, was in a great mistake when he thought, that to argue from this Election to that of an ordinary Pastor, is invalid. The 120 Disciples, their Suffrages and Lots being guided by an extraordinary Providence, elected *Matthias* to the Apostolical Office: wherefore the Christian People now, their Suffrages being guided by an ordinary Providence, may elect ordinary Officers, or choose Persons to the Ministerial Office. And we may say, that the Argument for Popular Elections taken from the Election of *Matthias*, is something stronger than it is commonly look'd on to be. Since the People elected one to the Apostolical Office, it may be expected that few will be so unreasonable as to deny them a Right to elect Bishops or Pastors, the Argument *a majori ad minus* being convincing.

It will be objected, If these who are call'd by Lot, are nothing more immediately call'd by God than these who are call'd by the Suffrages of the People, and if the Election of *Matthias* by the Lot was an Act and Deed of the People's, as well as the Election of *Matthias* and *Barsabas* by the Suffrages of the People, so that *Matthias* was elected to the Apostolical Office by the People, and consequently made an Apostle by them, then was *Matthias* call'd to his Office in a mediate and ordinary way, and if he was call'd to his Office in an ordinary way, then was he an ordinary Officer as Ministers now; and if this be, then was he no Apostle, Apostles being extraordinary Officers, and it being essential to them to be extraordinarily call'd.

I look on't as certain, that it is not to be imagin'd that when Persons are elected to any Offices by Lot, they are call'd to these Offices in a more

special manner, or more immediate way by God, than other Persons who are call'd to the same or like Offices by the Suffrages of the People; for God doth not determine the Lot in an immediate way, or guide the Elections perform'd thereby so as they shall always hit right, more than he guideth in an immediate way the Elections perform'd by Suffrages, so that the People shall always make the best Choice; and if People refer an Election to the Lot, they are never a whit surer of the mind of God thereby, than they would have been if they had carried on the said Election by the Cheirotonia or Suffrage. Wherefore, whether People elect a Person by Lot or Suffrages, it is the same thing upon the Matter, and is equally the Peoples Deed: and consequently *Matthias's* Election, its being perform'd by the Lot, did in no ways hinder it to be the People's Election.

What I have said with respect to the Lot, is evident enough from the Case of *Achan*. A Crime was committed in the Camp, the accurs'd thing was stol'n, and no body knew by whom; the Tryal was referr'd to the Lot, and the several Tribes being presented, the Lot lighted leel upon that of *Judah*; and when the several Families of that Tribe were presented, the Lot fell upon the Family of the *Zarhites*, then upon *Zabdi*; and his Household being taken, the Lot fell exactly upon *Achan*, who was the guilty Person. But if People think to find out secret Crimes now after this manner, they will be in a great mistake, the Lot will not perhaps go right once in a hundred times. And hence I say, it is abundantly evident, that God doth not guide the Lot in a specialler manner or more immediate way, than he guideth the People's Suffrages: unless ye will say, that God guideth the Lot in a more special way at Elections to Offices, than on other Occasions, which we have no Ground at all to imagine,

gine, there being no Promise in the least that way.

I grant, that when Elections are perform'd by Lot, God disposeth upon the Lot by a common Providence, and determines it as he pleases, so that God elects the Person who is elected by the Lot; but then it is as true that he has the Disposal of the Suffrages of the People every way as much in his hand, as the Disposal of the Lot; so that the Election by Suffrages is in all respects as much from God, as the Election by Lot is. And who will say, that the Magistrates in *Venice*, who are elected by the Ballot, are in a more special manner or immediate way elected by God, than Magistrates in other Kingdoms, who are chosen by the Cheirotonia or Suffrage of the People? If this were, all Officers in Church and State should be chosen by the Lot, for the more immediately that Elections are from God, the better and more desirable are they. And hence it is evident we have no reason to conclude, that the Election of *Matthias* was more immediately from God, upon account it was perform'd by the Lot, than the Election of *Matthias* and *Barsabas*, which was done by the Suffrages of the People.

And seeing Election by the Lot is not in a more special manner of God, than the Election by the Suffrages of the People, there is no reason to think that the Election by the Lot (and especially by the Ballot, as was that of *Matthias*) is less the Election of the People, or their Deed, than the Election of the *Cheirotonia*, or by Suffrages. If a People, such as the 120, should elect two Persons they judge honest, and qualified equally, one of which is to be put in the Office, so that they are indifferent which of them be pitched on; and if they condescend that he upon whom the Lot shall fall, shall be put in the Office; and if after the giving forth of the Lot they instal him, and own him as such an

Officer, this Person is elected to his Office by the People, nor more nor less than if he had been chosen by their Elective Voices or Suffrages : and there is no reason to think, that this Election being perform'd by Lot, hinders it from being the Peoples Act, or their Election. And this was the Case with respect to the Election of *Matthias*, wherefore it cannot reasonably be denied that he was elected to the Apostolate by the People, or the 120.

And so much is evident from the Text it self, for the Election of *Matthias*, tho' perform'd by the Lot, is call'd the People's *Psephisma*, συγκατεψηφισθη, and *Psephisma* is *Plebis-scitum*, an Act or Decree made by the Will or Suffrage of the People. ἵνα μὴ μόνον ἐν τοῖς ψηφίσμασι καὶ ταῖς ἐπιστολαῖς πολεμήτε Φιλίππα, ἀλλὰ καὶ τοῖς ἔργοις. That you may fight against *Philip*, not by Decrees and Epistles only, but by Actions. *Demost. Or. 1. contra Philip*: And κατεψηφισθῶ is to decree, θάνατον αὐτῷ κατεψηφισαμένθ, morte illi decreta †. *Ælian. l. 2. c. 7.* And συγκατεψηφισθῶ signifies, *una eligo*; or *decerno*. And when a Society of People is said συγκατεψηφισεν, it must be understood of their Electing or Decreeing by their Suffrages; for this is the way that they use to elect or decree. So that συγκατεψηφισθη μετὰ τῶν ἑνδεκά Ἀποστόλων is as much as to say, that *Matthias* was put in the Apostolical Office by the Decree of the 120, or was number'd among the eleven Apostles by their Suffrages. All that the Ministers have to say is, That *Matthias* was elected by God, and therefore συγκατεψηφισθη must be taken in an improper and general Sense *. I answer, If *Matthias* had been

been

† ὥς γὰρ ἔκ ἐξουσιᾶς ἀνευ τῆ δέουσας θάνατον πολεῖτε κατεψηφισαμένθ. i. e. That it was not in the Power of the Senat to decree the Death of a Citizen without the People. *Dion. Cassi Hist Rom. lib. 37.*

* As to what they say, that *Matthias* was chosen by Lot, and not by Stones, is frivolous. *Thucyd. lib. 1. Sect. 87.* says of the Lacedemonians κερύκεσι γὰρ βοῇ καὶ ἔψηφον. *Voce enim non calculis suffragia ferunt.*

been elected by God, so as to exclude the People, this would have been something, but seeing God elected him by the Suffrages of the People and their Lots, it doth not at all follow, that συγκατεψηφισθῆναι must be taken in a general and improper Sense, as they pretend. God's Electing a Person to an Office after the manner he elected *Matthias*, does not at all hinder the Election to be the People's Deed. Thus *Acts* 13. 20. God gave Judges to the People of Israel; yet that People did elect Judges to themselves, *Judg: ch. 11. v. 11.* Thus God elected *Feroboam* to be King of Israel, *1. Kings 11. 35.* I will take the kingdom out of his sons hand, and I will give it unto thee, even ten Tribes. Yet *Feroboam* was elected by the People, *1. Kings 12. 20.* And it came to pass when all Israel heard that *Feroboam* was come again, that they sent and call'd him to the congregation, and made him king over all Israel. And the reason is obvious, for when God elects after this manner, he elects in and by the People.

Now as to the Call of *Matthias*, I do not indeed think that it was an immediate Call in a strict Sense, or that it can be said thereof, as *Paul* said of his ἐκ ἀπ' ἀνθρώπων καὶ ἐξ ἐδ' ἀνθρώπων, and as it may be said of the Call of the rest of the Apostles; for it is most evident, that God call'd him mediately, partly by the Suffrages of the People, and partly by their Lots.

Yet *Matthias's* was not an ordinary Call, as the Calls of ordinary Officers or Ministers of the Gospel are now, but extraordinary; and it was an extraordinary Call in that God directed the Lots by an extraordinary Providence, as in the Case of *Achan*

Yet *Thucyd.* says in the same Book, Sect. 20. ὥσπερ τῆς τε Λακεδαιμονίων βασιλέας μὴ μιᾷ ψήφῳ προτίθεσθαι ἑκατέραν ἀλλὰ δύο. i. e. *Lacedæmoniorum Reges in suffragiis ferendis, non singulis quemque sed binis uti calculis.* That is, That the *Lacedæmonian* Kings have each of them two Votes or Suffrages.

chan, and guided the Suffrages of the People or 120 the same way, so that both the Suffrages and Lots were ordered infallibly, in such sort, that if Jesus Christ had interpos'd in an immediate way, and nominated the Person by an audible Voice from Heaven, or the Message of an Angel, *Matthias* would have been the Person he would have pitched upon to be the Apostle, and no other. And that was in my Opinion an Apostolical Call Authentick enough. And if it be enquir'd, why Christ call'd *Matthias* after this manner, and not in a way altogether immediate, as he call'd *Paul* and the rest of the Apostles? I say, He did it, *first*, that none might presume to quarrel mediate Calls, seeing one was call'd even to the Apostolical Office that way; *Secondly*, to let us see who they are, who have a Power or Right to give lawful Calls to the Bishops or Ministers of the Gospel, who are the Successours of the Apostles, even the Church and Spouse of Jesus Christ: Wherefore these Calls, which come from another Airth, are against the Mind and Institution of Jesus Christ, are not lawful and Gospel Calls, and the Blessing of God cannot reasonably be expected upon the Ministry of such Persons, who enter not by the Door into the Sheep-fold, but climb up some other way. Now, for further clearing of this Point, I shall subjoin a few Propositions, and then conclude.

1. You must consider a Church or Congregation as an Ecclesiastical Society (a Common-wealth, *Ephes: ch. 2. v. 12.* or a City or Incorporation, *Psal. 46. 4. and 87. 3. Hebr: 12. 22. Revel: 22. 19.*) having its Ecclesiastical Privileges, as a Civil Society has its Civil Privileges.

2. The Privileges of the Civil Society or Incorporation belong equally to all these that are the Citizens or Burgeßes. In like manner the Ecclesiastical Privileges belong to all these in common
who

who are the Burgesſes of the Heavenly Jeruſalem, or Church.

3. All theſe are Burgeſſes of the City, who are admitted by the Corporation, and get Burgeſs-Tickets. In like manner all theſe are Burgeſſes of the Heavenly Jeruſalem or Church, who are admitted to the Table of the Lord, be they bond or free, Maſters of Families or not. *There is neither Jew nor Greek, there is neither bond nor free, there is neither male nor female, for ye are all one in Chriſt Jeſus.* And theſe who cannot be admitted to the Table upon the account of Ignorance, Profanity, or Hereſie, &c. be they great or ſmall, rich or poor, they ſhould have no Elective Voice in the Choofing of a Biſhop or Miniſter.

4. In the Corporation or City, Perſons act or vote, not as they are rich, but as they are Burgeſſes, the meaneſt Burgeſs has his Suffrage or Elective Voice in the choofing of the Major, and the richeſt Burgeſs can pretend to no more. In like manner Perſons give their Suffrages in the Election of Biſhops or Paſtors, not as they are rich, but as they are Chriſtians, not as they are Lords, Barons, Heritors, &c. but as they are Faithful in Chriſt Jeſus, and have a Right to Chriſtian or Eccleſiaſtical Privileges. Wherefore the pooreſt Servant, Weaver or Cobler, has his Elective Voice in the Creation of a Biſhop, and the greateſt Lord or Baron can pretend to no more. The meaneſt Tradesmen belong to the peculiar People, the Royal Priethood are *Kings and Priests to God, and to Chriſt*, have as full a Right to ſit down at the Table of the Lord, or to demand Baptiſm to their Children, as the greateſt Princes or Nobles; and therefore have as good a Right as they to give their Voices in the Election of Biſhops. Theſe then who object that our Paſtors are elected or call'd by Weavers, Shoemakers, &c. ſpeak profanely and ignorantly.

5. In a City or Corporation the Female Burgeses have a Right to emolumentary Privileges, such as Buying and Selling, &c. but are excluded, upon the account of their Sex, from these things that have relation to the Government, have no elective Voice in choosing the Magistrates, Parliament-Men, &c. And thus it is with respect to the Church or Ecclesiastical Corporation. Thus *Acts* Ch. 15. we read of a Meeting of the Apostles and Elders and *Brethren* about an Affair of Government; but not of the *Sisters*. Thus *Cyprian*, *Ut de universæ Fraternitatis suffragio Episcopatus ei deferretur. Sabinus* was elected by the Suffrages of the whole *Brotherhood*. And when one was to be substituted in the room of *Judas*, *Peter* stood up in the midst of the Disciples, and said, *Men and Brethren*. Wherefore I confess I cannot approve the Practice of our Church in allowing an Elective Voice to some Women, as to Heresses a Right to subscribe Calls to Ministers or Bishops.

6. In a City or Corporation the poorer Burgeses are not deprived of their just Privilege of giving their Suffrage in the Election of the Mayor, on pretence that they may perhaps be obliged to remove some time afterward and dwell in a neighbouring City or Place for greater conveniency of living. Neither should the poorer sort of Believers, and Sons of God or Brethren of Jesus Christ, such as Farmers, Trades-men, or Servants, be deprived of their just Right of giving their Suffrage in the Election of a Bishop or Pastor for the Church or Congregation of which they are Members at the time, because perhaps some of them may remove afterward, and dwell in a neighbouring Church.

Now from what is here said two things may be gathered. (1) When we say that the People have the Power or Right of Electing their Bishops, by *People* we do not understand the common People only;

only, but all these belonging to a Church or Spiritual Corporation, Lords, Barons, Magistrates, Trades-men, Servants, or be who they will that are admitted to the Participation of the Sacraments, (2) It is as much contrary to the Light of Nature or common Sense, and Rules of Government, that one Member of a Church or Ecclesiastical Society, or a Patron have the Power of Electing a Bishop or Pastor to the Church or Congregation, as it is contrary to the same Light, and Natural Privileges of the Citizens of *London*, that one rich Burgeſs choole the Mayor of that City; or as it is contrary to common Sense, that one toping Gentleman or Nobleman should be permitted to elect Parliament-Men for the whole Shire; or one great Lord or Duke to elect the King, if the Throne were vacant, &c.

And from the whole that has been said on this head, we may conclude, that the Bishops were not Monarchs of their Churches, and that the Supreme Power Ecclesiastical was not lodged in them: for the Power of Elections is a part of the Supreme Power of the Common-wealth, and a principal part too, and in all Monarchies this Power is lodged in the Person of the Prince: but the Bishops had not the Power of Elections, nay not of the meanest Officers, not of the Deacons themselves; it is ridiculous then to pretend that they were Ecclesiastical Monarchs. To salve this, they ordinarily tell us, that the Bishop has the Power of Ordination. But this is a meer Jest. For besides that the Right of Ordinations in a Church was not lodged in the Bishop alone, seeing the Presbyters concurr'd with him in that work, the Power of Ordination can scarce be call'd any Power at all, Election or the Determination of the Person is the main thing, and the essential Point in the Creation of Officers whether Civil or Ecclesiastical; and Ordination is no-

B b b

thing

thing but a Circumstance or Ceremony: These who ordain Officers, if the Election of them be in the Power of others, have little or rather no share at all in their Promotion. These who elect, say they, do nothing but *name the Person*, but they who ordain, create and make the Officer, and confer the Office-Power on him. But our Churchmen cheat themselves by such weak Contrivances. The *Nomination of the Person* is the very principal thing in the Creation of any Officer Civil or Ecclesiastical, Bishop or Magistrate; and Ordination is but a meer trifle if compar'd with it. Whether has the Parliament who elects the King, or the Bishop who ordains him, anoints him, consecrates him, or crowns him, the greatest hand in the Promotion of the King, or which of them confers the Office or Regal Power upon him? If our Parliament should make an Act by which they should reserve the Election of all Officers Civil and Military in their own hand, and should send word to the King, that they did not at all intend to deprive him of the Prerogative he had before of creating all these Officers, that he should still have the Power as formerly, to constitute all the Officers in the Kingdom, to make them, and to confer the Office-Power upon them, whether by Ordination, laying on of hands, or any other way he thought fit, and they should reserve no more to themselves but only the *Nomination* of them, would not the King have reason to think, that they were mocking him? If he were depriv'd of the Power of electing them, what would that which they call the Power of Constituting or Conferred the Office-Power upon them, signify to him? That Power would be next neighbour to nothing. I think that this may be sufficient to open People's eyes, and to convince them that the Power of Ordination is in effect no Power at all; and seeing Ordination is all that belongs to the Bishops in the

Constituting of Church-Officers, the share that they have in the Promoting or Conferring the Office-Power upon them, is so very small, that our thoughts cannot feel it. Mr. *Dodwel* says, That tho the People (Act 6.) elected the Seven Deacons, the Apostles not only gave them the *Investiture*, but the *Authority* it self, because they said, *ὅς καταστήσωμεν*, so that the Deacons did not derive their Authority or Office-Power from these who elected them, but from the Apostles who *constituted* or ordain'd them. But I'm afraid that Mr. *Dodwel's* Admirers will get the beguile, if they rely too much on his word here. *Isocrates* (in *Panathen:*) says, That the Magistrates of *Athens* constituted these Persons Officers or Rulers, whom the People did elect, *καθίσασαν ἐπὶ τὰς ἀρχὰς τῶν προκριθέντας ὑπὸ τῆς συμβουλευτῶν, καὶ τῆς δημοτῶν*. But at *Athens* the Power was lodged in the People, therefore the Magistrates there derived their Authority or Office-Power from the People by their Election, and not from the other Magistrates who *constituted*, placed them, or gave them the *Investiture*. It will not follow then that the Deacons derived their Authority from the Apostles, because they said, *ὅς καταστήσωμεν*, whom we may constitute or appoint over this Business. It is true this word frequently imports giving the Authority or Office Power, thus *Pharo* *κατέστησεν* constituted *Joseph* Governour over *Egypt*; and King *Philip* constituted three Tyrants, *τρεῖς κατέστησε τυράννικς*. But *Pharo* and *Philip* had the Power of Election, and constituted these Persons such Officers by electing them. And it will by no means follow, that because Officers derive their Authority or Office Power from these who constitute them by Election, therefore they derive their Authority or Office Power from these who constitute them only by ordaining and

Separ. of
Church &c.
p. 451.

Acts 7.
Demosth:
Or. 3. in
Phil.

placing them, and giving them the Investiture, not having the Right of Elections. Or it will not follow that *κατασκευα* signifies or imports giving the Authority or Office-Power when it comprehends nothing but Ordination or Investiture, because it imports so much when it comprehends Election, or when the Person or Persons who are said *κατασκευα*, have the Power of Elections. They who have the power of electing, constitute as Masters or Lords, as *Isocrates* says (in *Areopag.*) *ἐτι δὲ τὸ μὲν δῆμον ὥσπερ τύραννον καθιστάναι τὰς ἀρχάς*, *Oportere Populum, tanquam Dominum, constituere Magistratus*: whereas they who constitute only by Ordination or placing in the Office, constitute as Ministers or Servants. In this Sense *Titus* constituted Elders in every City (*Tit. chap. 1 v. 5.*) that is, he constituted them as a Servant or Minister for he had not the power of Elections, but only of Ordination.

Wherefore the *English Minister Thomas Gipps* Rector of *Bury*, spake not only as a Calumniator, but as a Fool, when he said that the Presbyterians in *Scotland* did Corrupt some Copies of the Bible, by putting *whom YE may appoint over this business*, instead of, *whom WE may appoint over this business*, (*Acts Ch. 6. v. 3.*) that they might thereby prove that the People have a Power to *Constitute* their own Officers or Ministers, seeing the People do *Constitute* their Officers, and *Constitute* them in a more proper Sense than they do who only ordain them; they *Constitute* them by Election, and they who *Constitute* Officers by Election, *Constitute* them Magisterially, giving them the Authority and Office Power, whereas they who have not the Right of Election and *Constitute* only by Ordination, *Constitute* but Ministerially by placing them, or giving the Investiture.

Neither is it an absurd thing to say that the People have a Right to ordain their own Bishops or Pastors, taking Ordination in a strict Sense for Ordination by laying on of Hands. Not that the the People themselves should lay on Hands, but they ordain their Bishops in a mediate way, as the Nation creates a King when the Throne is vacant mediately by the Parliament, or their Representatives. Hear what the Illustrious M. *Claude* says with respect to this particular. *Defense de la Reform: Tome 2. Part 4. Pag. 366, &c.*

‘ The Donatists in Ancient times, says he, fell into
 ‘ this extravagance, to imagine that the Preach-
 ‘ ing of the Word, the Administration of the Sacra-
 ‘ ments and other Acts of Ministry were not valid,
 ‘ unless performed by Bishops or Pastors that are
 ‘ true Believers and in a state of Grace; So that
 ‘ being prejudged by this Fancy, and thinking that
 ‘ the whole body of the Pastors which keep’d up
 ‘ Communion with *Cecilianus*, was fallen from a state
 ‘ of Grace and become Wicked, they maintain’d
 ‘ that there were no Church in the World, but a-
 ‘ mong the party of *Donatus*. But *Augustin* proved
 ‘ to them that that their Principle was false, and it
 ‘ is well worth the while to observe the method
 ‘ he did take to Convince them of the Fallacy of
 ‘ their Opinion. He neither told them, tho’ the
 ‘ whole body of the Bishops or Pastors were Wick-
 ‘ ed, they were the true Church of Jesus Christ
 ‘ notwithstanding: Neither, that Christ having at
 ‘ first committed the Ministerial Office to the Bi-
 ‘ shops he had thereby engaged himself to keep them
 ‘ in a state of Grace, or at least to have always
 ‘ true Believers in the body of the Pastors, and that
 ‘ those rendered the Sacraments valid that were Ad-
 ‘ ministrated by the rest. He told them none of
 ‘ those things. But he had recourse to the body
 ‘ of the Church, and said that the Sacraments were

' not the Sacraments of the Bishops or Pastors, that
 ' the power of the Keys did not belong to them
 ' nor the power of binding and loosing, nor the o-
 ' ther Acts of the Ministry or Episcopal Office, but
 ' that all these things did belong to the Church, so
 ' that it is the Church that Baptizeth when the Bi-
 ' shops or Pastors Baptize, it is the Church that
 ' bindeth when the Pastors bind, it is she that
 ' looseth when the Pastors loose, and that Jesus
 ' Christ gave all these things to the Church. But
 ' what did *Augustin* understand by the Church?
 ' Even the faithful People where ever they are, the
 ' *Wheat* of God, the *Good grain*, the *Good fishes* as
 ' he calls them, in one word the Saints, true Be-
 ' lievers to the exclusion of the Hypocritical. It
 ' was from this source that he derived the *Validity*
 ' of the *Sacraments*, and other functions of the Epis-
 ' copacy, and not from the Pastors (as doth Mr.
 ' *Dodwell*.) And I say the same thing. Whatever
 ' the Bishops or Pastors do, they do it in the name
 ' of the Church, and consequently in the Name of
 ' Jesus Christ, for *the Name of Christ is in the Church*,
 ' it is the Church that preaches by them, the Church
 ' administers the Sacraments by them, Governs by
 ' them, Censures, Suspends, Absolves, or Excom-
 ' municates by them, the Bishops or Pastors are
 ' her Ministers and Dispensators of her Rights.

This Doctrine of *Augustin's* will not at all relish
 with *J. S.* In a word, it quite overthrows Mr. *Dod-*
well's grand Hypothesis, and blasts all his Arguments
 by which he undertakes to prove the Dissenters to
 be Schismatics. *J. S.* says, that M. *Dodwell* is such
 an Author that he would rather contradict a hun-
 dred than him, perhaps a hundred *Augustin's* and
Cyprian's. For my part, if I were to Pin my Faith
 to any Man's Sleeve, I would pin it to *Augustin's*
 much rather than to M. *Dodwell's*, for several
 Reasons which are very obvious.

How.

However, supposing (which is most false) that *Cyprian* declares for modern Prelacy, and affirms it to be of Divine Right, I cannot but wonder how *J.S.* comes to fancy that the Presbyterians should believe it, because *Cyprian* says it, seeing he himself does not believe that Christ gave the *Keys of the Kingdom of Heaven* to the People, tho' *Augustin* affirms it, who perhaps was the greatest and most Eminent Doctor that ever the Church had since the days of the Apostles.

F I N I S.

The Apostolical Institution of Episcopal Demonstration, by William Chillingworth.

IF we abstract from Episcopal Government all Accidentals, and consider only what is Essential and Necessary to it, we shall find in it no more but this : An Appointment of one Man of Eminent Sanctity and Sufficiency to have the care of all the Churches within a certain Precinct or Diocese, and furnishing him with Authority, not Absolute or Arbitrary, but regulated and bounded by Laws, and moderated by joining to him a convenient Number of Assistants, to the intent that all the Churches under him may be provided of good and able Pastors, and that both of Pastors and People conformity to Laws, and performance of their Duties may be required, under Penalties, not left to Discretion, but by Law appointed.

That this Government was received Universally in the Church, either in the Apostles time, or presently after, is so Evident and Unquestionable, that the most
Learned

Learned Adversaries of this Government do themselves confess it.

Petrus Molinæus in his Book de Munere Pastoralis, purposely written in Defence of the Presbyterial Government, acknowledgeth, That presently after the Apostles time, or even in their time (as Ecclesiastical Story witnesseth) it was ordained, that in every City one of the Presbytery should be called a Bishop, who should have Prebeminence over his Collegues, to avoid Confusion which oft times ariseth out of Equality. And truly this form of Government all Churches every where received.

Theodorus Beza, in his Tract De Triplici Episcopatus Genere, confesseth in effect the same thing: For having distinguished Episcopacy into three kinds; Divine, Humane and Satanical, and attributing to the second (which he calls Humane but we maintain and conceive to be Apostolical) not only a Priority of Order, but a Superiority of Power, and Authority over Presbyters, bounded yet by Laws and Canons provided against Tyranny: He clearly professeth, that of this kind of Episcopacy is to be understood, whatsoever we read concerning the Authority of Bishops or Presidents (as Justin Martyr calls them) in Ignatius, and other more ancient Writers.

Certainly from these two great Defenders of the Presbytery we should never had this free acknowledgment, so prejudicial to their own pretence, and so Advantageous to their Adversaries purpose, had not the Evidence of clear and undeniable Truth enforced 'em to it: It will not therefore be necessary to spend any time in confuting that uningenuous Assertion of the Anonymous Author of the Catalogue of Testimonies for the Equality of Bishops and Presbyters, who affirms, that their Disparity began long after the Apostles times; but we may safely take for granted that which these two learned Adversaries have confessed; and see whether upon this foundation

dation laid by them, we may not by unanswerable Reason raise this Superstructure.

That seing Episcopal Government is confessedly so Ancient, and so Catholick, it cannot with Reason be denyed to be Apostolick.

For so great a Change, as between Presbyterial Government and Episcopal, could not possibly have prevail'd all the VWorld over, in a little time. Had Episcopal Government been an Aberration from, or a Corruption of the Government left in the Churches by the Apostles, it had been very strange, that it should have been received in any one Church so suddenly, or that it should have prevail'd in all for many Ages after. Variasse debuerat Error Ecclesiarum, quod autem apud omnes unum est, non est erratum, sed traditum. Had the Churches Err'd, they would have varied, what therefore is one and the same amongst all, came not sure by Error, but Tradition. Thus Tertullian argues very probably from the Consent of the Churches of his time, not long after the Apostles, and that in matter of Opinion much more subject to unobserved Alteration. But that in the frame and substance of the necessary Government of the Church, a thing always in use and Practice, there should be so sudden a change as presently after the Apostles times, and so Universal, as received in all the Churches, this is clearly impossible.

For what Universal Cause can be assign'd or fain'd of this Universal Apostasie? You will not imagine that the Apostles, all or any of 'em, made any Decree for this Change when they were living, or left order for it in any VWill or Testament when they were Dying: This were to grant the Question, to wit, That the Apostles being to leave the Government of the Churches themselves, and either seing by Experience, or fore-seeing by the Spirit of God, the Distractions and Disorders which would arise from a Multitude of Equals, substituted Episcopal Government in stead of their own. General Councils, to make a Law for a General Change, for many Ages there were none. There was no Christian

Emperor, no Coercive Power over the Church to enforce it; Or if there had been any, we know no Force was equal to the Courage of the Christians of those times: Their Lives were then at command (for they had not then learn'd to fight for Christ) but their Obedience to any thing against his Law was not to be commanded (for they had perfectly learn'd to Die for Him) therefore there was no Power then to command this Change, or if there had been any, it had been in vain.

What Device then shall we study, or to what Fountain shall we reduce this strange pretended Alteration? Can it enter into our Hearts to think, that all the Presbyters and other Christians then being the Apostles Scholars, could be generally Ignorant of the VVill of Christ, touching the necessity of a Presbyterial Government? Or dare we Adventure to think them so strangely wicked all the World over, as against Knowledge and Conscience to Conspire against it? Imagine the Spirit of Diotrophes had entred into some, or a great many of the Presbyters, and possessed them with an ambitious Desire of a forbidden Superiority, was it possible they should attempt and atchieve it at once, without any Opposition or Contradiction? And besides that the Contagion of this Ambition should spread it self and prevail without stop and controul, nay without any Noise or Notice taken of it, thro' all the Churches in the world, all the Watchmen in the meantime being so fast a sleep, and all the Dogs so Dumb, that not so much as one should open his Mouth against it? But let us suppose (tho it be a horrible untruth) that the Presbyters and People then were not so good Christians as the Presbyters are now, that they were generally so Negligent to retain the Government of Christ's Church commanded by Christ, which now we are so Zealous to restore; yet certainly we must not forget nor deny that they were Men as we are. And if we look upon them but as meer natural Men, yet knowing by Experience how hard a thing it is even for Policy arm'd with Power, by many Attempts and Contrivances

and in a long time to gain upon the liberty of any one People, undoubtedly we shall never entertain so wild an Imagination, as that among all the Christian Presbyteries in the World, neither Conscience of Duty, nor Love of Liberty, nor Aversness from Pride and Usurpation of others over them, should prevail so much as with any one, to oppose this pretended Universal Invasion of the Kingdom of Christ, and the Liberty of Christians.

When I shall see therefore all the Fables in the Metamorphosis acted and prove Stories, when I shall see all the Democracies and Aristocracies in the world ly down and sleep, and awake into Monarchies; then I will begin to believe that Presbyterial Government, having continued in the Church during the Apostles times, should presently after, against the Apostles Doctrine and the will of Christ, be whirl'd about like a Schene in a Mask, and transform'd into Episcopacy. In the mean time, while these things remain thus incredible, and in humane Reason impossible, I kope I shall have leave to conclude thus, Episcopal Government is acknowledged to have been Universally received in the Church presently after the Apostles times. Between the Apostles time and this presently after, there was not time enough for, nor possibility of so great an Alteration. And therefore Episcopacy, being confess'd to be so Ancient and Catholick, must be granted also to be Apostolick. Quod erat demonstrandum.

The CONTENTS.

- C**HAP. I. The State of the Controversy between us and Mr. *Chillingworth* cleared, and the several Propositions he should have demonstrated, pointed at. Pag: 1
- C**HAP. II. The Falsity of the first Proposition, which Mr. *Chillingworth* should have demonstrated, evidenced by making it appear, that the Ancient Bishops were Pastors of one Congregation only. Dr. *Maurice*'s Exceptions answered. 12
- C**HAP. III. The same thing is further evidenced by Arguments from *Cyprian*'s Epistles, and Dr. *Maurice*'s Exceptions taken off. 24
- C**HAP. IV. The Falsity of the second Proposition Mr. *Chillingworth* should have demonstrated, discovered by making it appear, that the Ancient Bishop acted in Affairs of Government, in conjunction with all the Presbyters of the Diocese, and not a convenient Number of Assistants only. 54
- C**HAP. V. The Falsity of the third Proposition Mr. *Chillingworth* should have proven, manifested. 56
- C**HAP. VI. The Superstructure, which Mr. *Chillingworth* builds upon the foresaid false Foundation, overturned. 61
- C**HAP. VII. The Arguments of the Prelatists for their Bishops are as weak as the Arguments of the Papists for Transubstantiation. 67
- A**PPENDIX, wherein it is made evident, That not only the Episcopal Diocesses or Churches, were single Congregations only in the days of *Cyprian*, but that it was reckon'd a Crime then, and even to destroy a Church, to erect a Congregation in it besides the Bishop's Congregation : By way of Addition to Chap. 3. pag. 24. 85
- The Reverend Archbishop *Usher*'s Original of Bishops and Metropolitans consider'd; where it is made evident, That it makes nothing for that which is now called *Episcopacy*. 105

The Bishops in Cyprian's time had neither Absolute Power, nor a Negative Voice in their Churches. 109

CHAP. I. The State of Episcopacy in the days of *Cyprian*, or an Account of the Power that the Bishops had then. The Difference between the Bishops in those days, and these which the Apostles left in the Churches, and the Degrees by which it may be suppos'd, the Alterations that Episcopacy suffered, were carried on. 109

CHAP. II. That the Bishop had not Absolute Power in the Church. 128

CHAP. III. That the Bishop had not a Negative Voice in the second and third Centuries. 133

CHAP. IV. The Arguments of the Prelatists, from Terms and Phrases in *Cyprian's* Works or elsewhere, or from the Episcopal Prerogative, prove not, That the Bishop had either Absolute Power, or a Negative Voice, in the third Century. 183

CHAP. V. The Sentences in *Cyprian's* Works, which seem to import, That the Bishop had Absolute Power, or that he alone could dispose of Ecclesiastical Affairs within his own Diocese, more particularly considered. 211

CHAP. VI. Other Arguments answered, by which they think to prove, That the Bishop had a Sovereign or Monarchical Power in *Cyprian's* time. 259

CHAP. VII. That which is now call'd Presbyterian Government in *Scotland*, is really Episcopal Government, in the same Sense the Government of the Church was Episcopal in the third and fourth Centuries. 269

CHAP. VIII. The same thing is further evidenced, by comparing the Discipline of this Church with that of the Ancient Church in many Particulars. 286

CHAP. IX. The Power of the People in electing their Bishops or Pastors, asserted and vindicated. 316

The Apostolical Institution of Episcopacy Demonstrated, by *William Killingworth*. 383

AD.

A D D E N D A.

Page. 229. Line 4. in Marg: after *τίθει* add,

It will be said here, that the Scholiast mistakes the meaning of this Word. But what then? seeing in the very next words *Nicias* says what the Scholiast makes him to say here, *εἰ ὀppώδεῖς τὸ ἀναλῆψαι*, i. e. If you are afraid to rescind this Decree, that is, to put it to the Vote again that it may be rescinded by the People. Moreover, *M. Hudson* renders this word thus, *De Concilii Sententia confirma*, which makes no less for our purpose.

Page 320. lin: 25. after Right, add

Very well we can think that the People could do more than all the Presbyters in the Election of the Bishop; for when *Cyprian* was made Bishop of *Carthage*, there were eight Presbyters in that Diocese, of which eight six did oppose his Election †, and only two of them approved thereof; yet the Suffrages of the Body of the People and the two Presbyters carried the Election of *Cyprian* to be Bishop, notwithstanding the Opposition made by the six Presbyters and their Adherents, or these who join'd with them.

† *Hoc enim quorundam Presbyterorum malignitas & perfidia perfecit, ne ad vos ante diem Paschæ venire licuisset, dum conjurationis suæ memores; & antiqua illa contra Episcopatum meum, immo contra Suffragium vestrum & Dei Judicium venena retinentes, instaurant veterem contra nos impugnationem suam, & sacrilegas Machinationes insidias solitis denuo revocant.* *Cypr: Ep. 43.* And says *Pontius*, *Quidam illi resisterunt.* And in *Ep: 59*, *Cyprian* says, *Nemo post Divinum Judicium, post Populi Suffragium, post Coepiscoporum consensum, Judicem se jam non Episcopi, sed Dei faceret*, taking no notice of the Presbyters, which gives us to understand that he thought the Essence of the Ministerial Call did ly in the People's Election, and that they could do much more than the Presbytery in the promotion of the Bishop. Be the by, by *Post Coepiscoporum Consensum*, here we may understand the meaning of *Episcoporum Judicio*, in *Epist: 67*, where *Cyprian* says, *Quod & apud vos factam videmus in Sabini Collegæ nostri Ordinatione, ut de universæ Fraternitatis Suffragio, & de Episcoporum qui in præsentia convenerant, Judicio Episcopatus ei deferretur.* So that *J. S.* was in a mistake when he fancied that a Bishop in *Cyprian's* time was chosen by the Suffrages or Elective Voices of the Neighbouring Bishops.

E R R A T A.

Page, 32. Line 15. in Marg. *Read* peccaverunt.
 Page. 41. lin: 5. *dele* his. Page. 56. l. 4. in marg: *read* *Posthumianus*. Ibid. l. last in marg: after Bishop, *add*
 Counc: Carth: An: 397, Can: 45. Page: 66. l. 14. *dele*

ERRATA.

I before imagine. Pag: 84. l. 11. in marg: *r. reject*.
Pag: 95. l. 13. *r. Christian*. Pag. 96. l. 34. *r. dispensed*. Pag: 104. l. 21. *dele* put. Pag: 107. l. 25. *r. as representing*. Pag. 110. l. 20. *r. the Conquest*. Pag: 126. l. 30. *r. his*. Pag: 174. l. 18. *r. tash*. P. 179. l. 8. *r. fierent*. P. 197. l. 17. *r. Censors*. *Ibid*: l. last in marg: *r. desævit*. P. 213. l. last, *r. head with*. P. 221. l. 33. put a comma after, may be. P. 231. l. 2. *r. 271*. p. 232. l: 9. in marg: *r. πενταετίαν προσεφηρίσαντο*. p. 240. l. 1. *r. these*. p. 248. l. 6, *r. builds*. p. 250. l. 32, after unlawfully ordained, *add*, or wanted Episcopal Ordination. p. 271. l. 34. after to, *add*, be. p. 273. l. 24, 25. for, or Diocess of the Church, *r. of the Diocess or Church*. p. 280. l. 5, *r. Courts*. p. 282. l. 26, *r. ab eis*. p. 283. l. 9, *r. Judges*. p. 284. l. 7. in marg: for divers, *r. Divine*. p. 285. l. 15. for it, *r. 14*. p: 295. l. 23, *r. ἄλλω*. p: 300. l. 30, *r. it is*. p. 304. l. 24, *r. a Pagan*. *Ibid*: l. 30. *dele* is. p: 309. l: 17, *r. negligent Penitents*. p: 312. l: 7, *r. taken off*. p. 319. l. 5, *r. Bishops*. p. 367. l. last, *after* fancy, *add*, they made her Queen *de novo*, for that would be to no purpose, and no more would be understood. p: 383. l. 12, 13. for Episcopal Demonstation, *r. Episcopacy demonstrated*.

THE HISTORY OF THE

The history of the city of London, from the first
 settlement of the Britons, to the present time.
 The first part of the history, from the first
 settlement of the Britons, to the reign of
 King Henry the Second. The second part, from
 the reign of King Henry the Second, to the
 reign of King Richard the First. The third
 part, from the reign of King Richard the
 First, to the reign of King John. The fourth
 part, from the reign of King John, to the
 reign of King Henry the Third. The fifth
 part, from the reign of King Henry the
 Third, to the reign of King Edward the
 First. The sixth part, from the reign of
 King Edward the First, to the reign of
 King Edward the Second. The seventh
 part, from the reign of King Edward the
 Second, to the reign of King Richard the
 Second. The eighth part, from the reign
 of King Richard the Second, to the reign
 of King Henry the Fourth. The ninth
 part, from the reign of King Henry the
 Fourth, to the reign of King Henry the
 Fifth. The tenth part, from the reign
 of King Henry the Fifth, to the reign
 of King Henry the Sixth. The eleventh
 part, from the reign of King Henry the
 Sixth, to the reign of King Edward the
 Fourth. The twelfth part, from the
 reign of King Edward the Fourth, to the
 reign of King Richard the Third. The
 thirteenth part, from the reign of King
 Richard the Third, to the reign of King
 Henry the Seventh. The fourteenth
 part, from the reign of King Henry the
 Seventh, to the reign of King Henry the
 Eighth. The fifteenth part, from the
 reign of King Henry the Eighth, to the
 reign of King Edward the Sixth. The
 sixteenth part, from the reign of King
 Edward the Sixth, to the reign of King
 James the First. The seventeenth
 part, from the reign of King James the
 First, to the reign of King James the
 Sixth. The eighteenth part, from the
 reign of King James the Sixth, to the
 reign of King Charles the First. The
 nineteenth part, from the reign of King
 Charles the First, to the reign of King
 Charles the Second. The twentieth
 part, from the reign of King Charles the
 Second, to the reign of King James the
 Second. The twenty-first part, from the
 reign of King James the Second, to the
 reign of King George the First. The
 twenty-second part, from the reign of
 King George the First, to the reign of
 King George the Second. The twenty-
 third part, from the reign of King George
 the Second, to the reign of King George
 the Third. The twenty-fourth part, from
 the reign of King George the Third, to
 the present time.











